

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

ANTI-PAPAL CATHOLICISM IN TUDOR ENGLAND

1535 - 1555

Warren John Soule
Cambridge, Massachusetts

1 May 1981

Submitted to the Faculty of the Episcopal Divinity School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Divinity

Thesis directed by The Reverend John E. Booty, Ph.D.

TO

WALTER MERRITT GREENWOOD

Kenyon College, 1977

The Episcopal Divinity School, 1981

συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ

I

The political movements of the first half of the sixteenth century in England present both a bewildering tapestry of names and faces which parade across the stage and then disappear, as well as a rich source of information by which modern English institutions in general, and the Ecclesia Anglicana in its various manifestations in particular, were born and from which they even today take their origin and to which they refer. The political controversies of the period between the establishment of the Royal Supremacy and the death of Queen Mary furnish the historian with a spectacle at once captivating and often confusing. To better understand the political and ecclesiastical patterns in this period of Tudor History, I suggest a tripartite organization of political associations, "parties", if you will, the interchange of which explains many of the historical confusions scattered over the period as well as better illuminates the stresses and conflicts which are one of the hallmarks of this period.

In postulating this tripartite theory of development, I use the term "party" advisedly. It is not intended in the sense of our modern American political party (Republican, Democrat, etc.), but rather in the sense of a group of like-minded Englishmen who agreed on some basic stands and often joined forces to bring about what they considered to be a desirable result. The three parties are evident at the beginning of the Reformation Parliament, and though they are not fully developed until later in the period under

consideration, they are nonetheless present in some of their basic manifestations very early on. The tripartite pattern is not limited to this particular period of English history, nor are the particular doctrines enunciated peculiar to either that time or place. Yet the dynamic relationship of each party interacting with the others explains many questions otherwise clouded.

The three parties which I am proposing exist in the period between 1535 and 1555 are as follows:

1. The Papalist, or "Catholic" party, led by Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor, John Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Reginald Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury (after 1556). This is a group which cannot accept the royal supremacy as enunciated, and remains loyal to orthodox Catholicism emanating from Rome.

2. The "Anglo-Protestant" party, led by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (1532-1556), and Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex. This is the group of reformers, commonly so-called, which appears strong at the beginning of the period under consideration in government circles, and throughout the period is influenced by Continental Protestantism and the trends apparent in Lutheran and Calvinist circles, to a greater or lesser extent.

3. The Anti-Papal Catholic, or "Henrician Catholic" party, led by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester (1531-1555), and Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk. This group is characterized by loyalty to the crown, by orthodox Catholicism (of what sort we

shall investigate later), and by varying political and popular support. This last group shall be the center of attention in this study, both by reason of its centrality to an understanding of the party struggle, as well as by reason of its relative obscurity in historical analysis of Tudor England. In the following pages the nature and distinctive characteristics of this party will be examined, and an attempt will be made to determine its hallmarks and some of its more outstanding members. By the isolation of its distinctive stands and positions, it will be separated both from the Papalist and Anglo-Protestant factions.

The period between 1535 and 1555 will be broken down into four relatively unequal subdivisions. The first covers the period between the Act of Supremacy and the execution of Thomas Cromwell in 1540. By 1535, the royal supremacy had been established by Parliament; the bishops had renounced the jurisdiction of the Pope; but it remained to persuade the people of the wisdom of these changes. So, early in June 1535, Henry VIII issued a proclamation to the bishops commanding each of them in his "own proper person" to preach every Sunday and high feast, not only the sincere word of God, but also the validity of the King's title of Supreme Head, and to instruct the clergy and schoolmasters in their dioceses to preach and teach the same.¹ The issue at the beginning of the

1. Westminster, 9 June 1535, 27 Henry VIII, "Enforcing Statutes Abolishing Papal Authority in England", Proclamation 158 in Tudor Royal Proclamations, Volume I, The Early Tudors (1485-1553), ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964. pp. 229-232.

period which marks off the parties is the royal supremacy. The executions of More and Fisher (More on 6 July, Fisher on 22 June) crystallized the position of the Papalists rather quickly. Stephen Gardiner produced his Oration on True Obedience in September of that same year, and was requested to present a brief for the defence of the execution of Bishop Fisher that same year.² The position of Cromwell and Cranmer, though certainly not one of full-blown Protestantism, nor yet even that of their advanced continental contemporaries, stands out in further distinction. By the events of 1535, the three parties are seen as clearly distinct and relatively well defined on the issue of the royal supremacy. In 1540, five years later, the Papalists have by and large retreated to a negligible political influence within England, although there is still influence from Papal Catholicism from across the Channel. Cromwell has fallen from power, and is executed in 1540 for treason; Cranmer, defeated in the battle over the Six Articles of 1539, sends Mrs. Cranmer packing back to Germany; most other of the advanced party in England remain less influential than previously, and to a great extent consolidate the gains which were accomplished in the period since the establishment of the royal supremacy. Gardiner returns from his embassy to France in 1539 and is elected Chancellor of Cambridge in 1540. It is perhaps an oversimplification, but

2. cf. Pierre Janelle, Obedience in Church and State: Three Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner (hereinafter cited as Janelle, Obedience); New York: Greenwood Press, 1968. esp. pp. ix, xii-xvi. This work contains a text and translation of the De Vera Obedientia and the Tract on Fisher's Execution (Si Sedes Illa).

the period between 1535 and 1540 can be characterized as a period of Anglo-Protestant ascendancy.

The second period covers the events between Cromwell's execution (July 1540) and the death of Henry VIII (January 1547). The Papalist party remains either in exile or mute, although Reginald Pole (ordered deacon in 1536, but not elevated to the priesthood until 1556) was condemned by a Bill of Attainder in 1539. The Anglo-Protestant party, after the relative successes of the Great Bible (1539) and the Second Dissolution of the monasteries (same year), is less active than previously. The Anti-Papal Catholics, now in the ascendancy after the fall of Cromwell, use the Six Articles and their new political power. Gardiner is designated "chief minister" in 1542,³ and in the following year the King's Book appears, a revision of the Bishop's Book in an orthodox direction (the committee for the revision was dominated by Gardiner). The group was so successful that later in the period, in concert with others, Gardiner attempted to fasten a charge of heresy upon Archbishop Cranmer in connection with the Six Articles; and, but for the intervention of the king at the last minute, he probably would have succeeded. At the end of the period, the next major shift occurs with the death of Henry VIII. Several powerful Anti-Papal Catholics (Gardiner in particular) were excluded from the

3. James A. Muller (ed.), The Letters of Stephen Gardiner (hereinafter cited as Gardiner, Letters), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933. pp. xxiii and 299-316 (Letter 124. To Cranmer, Winchester, (after 12 June 1547)).

Regency Council set up by the will of Henry VIII (apparently at the last minute). Catherine Parr, Henry's sixth (and last) wife, of Protestant sympathies, along with Cranmer and several members of the Regency Council (especially Hertford, later the Duke of Somerset), gain control with the increasing illness of Henry VIII. With the fall of Norfolk, Gardiner's chief ally among the nobility, and the defection of Paget, Gardiner's one-time pupil and supporter, the Anti-Papal Catholic group declines in power and influence. Although Gardiner's name had been removed from the list of executors in Henry's will, he acted as chief officiant at Henry's funeral in February 1547, and attended the Archbishop at Edward VI's coronation. To suggest another comparison, the period between 1540 and 1547 can be characterized as a period of Anti-Papal Catholic ascendancy, and we shall return to this period in particular when considering the distinctive marks of this party.

The third period covers the events between the accession of Edward VI (1547) and the accession of Mary (1553). Papalist forces were present, although silent in England, and were influential among exiles on the Continent. Pole entreated Somerset to treat with the Pope, and on the death of Paul III was almost elected Pope himself (1549). Gardiner retired to his diocese, as did most of the previously active Anti-Papal Catholics, though few, if any, left the country. With the new Regency Council in power, the Anglo-Protestants began their program immediately with the dissolution of the chantries and the legalization of clerical marriage

(both 1547, when Mrs. Cranmer returns to England). The two major parties quickly came into direct conflict. On Edward's accession, Gardiner was removed from the Council of State and excluded from the Chancellorship of the University of Cambridge. In September 1547 he was committed to the Fleet on charges of having "spoken to others impertinent things of the King's Majesty's Visitations, and refused to set forth and receive the Injunctions and Homilies."⁴ His confinement was an effective way to prevent his organizing any effective conservative opposition in the Parliament of 1547. To a great extent, there is no effective political opposition to the Anglo-Protestant party during the period of Edward's reign, although there is considerable friction within the group. The coinage was debased in 1547 and 1549, and Somerset was replaced by Northumberland as Protector in the latter year. At the end of the reign, the Council became concerned over the young king's health, and feeling its power ebbing, saw what would be the consequences of the accession of Mary. Northumberland married his son to Lady Jane Gray in an abortive attempt to retain power. Politically, the period was one of increasing agitation. The Revolts of 1549 in Norfolk and the West Country unsettled the government sufficiently to cause the fall of the Protector. Also on the political level, the Anti-Papal Catholics by and large claimed that changes could

4. MS of the Privy Council Book, quoted in James Gairdner, A History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century from Henry VIII to Mary; London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1904. Vol. IV, p. 248.

be exercised by the King alone in person, and that the Regency Council (highly hostile to their interests in this period) was not competent to govern in the King's minority (an argument which, if not constitutionally sound, was at least politically shrewd). Unemployment was on the increase, vagrancy was rampant, a plague broke out in 1550, and the bottom fell out of the cloth market in Antwerp in 1551. All of these political considerations cannot help but have ramifications in the party structure.

But even more to the point, and perhaps more easily observable, were the ecclesiastical and theological controversies of the period. Early in the reign the tone was set by the measures to permit Communion in both kinds, and to enforce the reading of the Epistle and Gospel in English at High Mass (1547). The liturgical changes alone can be traced as a method of seeing the development of the Anglo-Protestant party; beginning with the abolition of images (1548), the Book of Common Prayer and its accompanying Act of Uniformity (1549), the Ordinal (1550), the second Book of Common Prayer (1552), and the Catechism and Primer (1553), there was a reasonable and observable progression in an increasingly more biblical and reformed direction. The Anti-Papal Catholic gains of the previous reign are taken away soon after Edward's accession: the Act of the Six Articles was repealed, as were the Lollard heresy laws (1547). The Forty-Two Articles of Religion stand in stark contrast to the Six Articles, and mark the "Calvinist" limit reached in the reign of Edward VI. However, when Gardiner was presented with a copy of the First Prayer

Book of Edward VI, and told that acceptance would assure his release, he consented, saying that there were enough places which were ambiguous so that a thoroughly Catholic bishop (like himself) could unhesitatingly support it. The interchange between Gardiner and Cranmer from this point on marks a significant chapter in the study of Eucharistic doctrine, and it is not a little useful in the estimation of the various positions taken by both Anti-Papal Catholics and Anglo-Protestants in the period. The theological controversies of the period, no less than the political ones, serve well to illuminate the struggle between the two parties left in England, and to reflect the influence of the Papalist party, not present in great numbers or in great power in Edward's reign. This period stands as the final ascendancy of the Anglo-Protestant party in the period under consideration (the first period being 1535-1540, although both the issues and doctrines were different, having changed in the intervening ten years.)

The final period covers the first two years of the reign of Queen Mary, from her accession in 1553 to the death of Gardiner in 1555. The first date is perhaps an obvious turning point. For the first time in almost twenty years, the professedly Papalist party was able to return to England, and not only was tolerated, but with new found prestige temporarily ran the government. Cardinal Pole, soon after his return, was ordained priest and absolved the realm from schism. The alliance with Spain, by marriage of Mary and Philip II, pointed England away from the continental Prot-

estant countries, and toward that most Catholic of nations. The Marian exiles, both too famous and too numerous to detail here, left the country. The Anglo-Protestant party, out of power totally for the first time in some while, either remained quiet or left the country. With the restoration of heresy laws and the bishops' courts, it became more and more difficult for the reformers to remain, though the actual persecution is probably less severe or widespread than has been previously estimated.⁵ The interesting group in this period is the Anti-Papal Catholic party. Having survived the strenuous onslaught of the Anglo-Protestant party, there is an increasing realization with the return of the Marian Catholics that the Catholicism of those arriving from the Continent was not the same as the English Catholicism of those who remained, or even that of twenty years earlier. The differences between the Anti-Papal Catholics and the returning Papalists, many (like Cardinal Pole) returning from the first two sessions of the Council of Trest, are instructive in further setting these two groups apart.

The first major problem which the period poses is that concerning Cardinal Pole and the absolution of the realm. One of the hallmarks of Anti-Papal Catholicism was its defence of the royal supremacy, indeed, from the very beginning. With the ab-

5. cf. Conrad Russell, The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660; New York: Oxford University Press, 1971. pp. 141-142; D. M. Loades, "The Enforcement of Reaction 1553-1558" in the Journal of Ecclesiastical History (1965), p. 62; and A. G. Dickens, The English Reformation; New York: Schocken Books, 1964. pp. 265-267.

solution, the party is in a dilemma. Scholars have suggested that many of the foremost Anti-Papal Catholics recanted their advocacy of the royal supremacy and returned to the Papalist fold. Yet, if we follow Gardiner as a guide, this is ambiguous. Whether or not Gardiner ever recanted his defense of the royal supremacy at all is an open question - with the preponderance of scholarship suggesting that he did not. The conditions placed upon Pole's entry, in particular with regard the status of lands formerly belonging to monastic houses suppressed under Cromwell, also argues for a less than wholehearted welcome for the return of Papal Catholicism. The Parliamentary opposition, led by Gardiner, against the marriage with Philip, while not primarily an ecclesiastical issue, does bear distinct ecclesiastical overtones. There is possibly a blending and blurring of parties in this period, but I suggest that they remain distinct, and that this final period is useful in distinguishing Papalism from Anti-Papal Catholicism. This period is the first time in the twenty year survey in which we can suggest a Papalist ascendancy.

The death of Stephen Gardiner in November of 1555 marks both a reasonable terminus for the first Marian period as well as for the study of Anti-Papal Catholicism as a whole. After this, the Marian reaction takes on a more violent and uncontrolled aspect. Having lost her trusted Chancellor, Mary proceeded down more and more radical paths. Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, Hooper, and others were executed for heresy; war was declared on France (and Calais

was lost); and her inability to produce children lost her affection among the people. It is perhaps significant that the two major protagonists (or antagonists) of the Anti-Papal Catholic and Anglo-Protestant parties should die so soon after each other; indeed, Cranmer was composing a reply to the late Bishop Gardiner on the Eucharist when he was executed. The death of Cardinal Pole less than two years after Cranmer in a real sense closes out the era which began with the Act of Supremacy and the other actions of the 1530's. When Mary died and Elizabeth ascended the throne, new faces appeared - different from those of twenty years earlier. By placing the terminus of this study at the death of Gardiner, we are able both to define manageable limits, but also to trace the movements and developments of parties more conveniently, in many cases by tracing the same people. Cranmer, Gardiner, and Pole stand out as the foremost ecclesiastical figures of the period in their respective parties, and by tracing them and their associates we can to a great extent participate in this turbulent period as well as understand better the distinctions between their positions and the positions of their parties throughout the period from the Act of Supremacy (1535) to the death of Bishop Gardiner (1555).

Having briefly defined the period under consideration, the next task is briefly to survey the parties under consideration and consider in turn both their distinctive positions and their notable leaders. The positions under consideration are not hard

and fast, and over the period there is considerable switching both between parties and within parties of members and positions. Yet it is useful at this point in the consideration to outline what will be dealt with at greater length later in this study, namely, the distinctive and characteristic positions of each of the three parties and the names and significance of their leaders.

Papalism is perhaps the easiest to define and consider. Throughout this period it held to Papal primacy, and there was consistent opposition to the royal supremacy. Yet this did not reflect a reactionary wish to return to the status quo ante 1535, for when the Marian Catholics came to power in the last period under consideration (1553-1555), they returned imbued with continental Catholicism, with a Catholicism being purified and strengthened by the Council of Trent, with a Catholicism newly aggressive and on the watch for heresy and sedition. The distinctive position of the party is Papal loyalty and opposition to the royal supremacy, but there are other positions which it has in common with other parties, viz., support of transubstantiation, auricular confession, monastic vows, etc., in common with standard Roman Catholic doctrine and practice. The major leaders of this party at the beginning were Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor under King Henry VIII, and John Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, both executed in 1535 for treason. Fisher strongly upheld the doctrines of the Real Presence and Eucharistic Sacrifice (in the De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, 1527), and though it was

included in his Latin Opera Omnia long after his death, he himself denied that he was the author of Henry VIII's Assertio Septem Sacramentorum, as was later asserted against him (though he probably advised in its composition).⁶ He was also confessor to Queen Catherine, and strongly protested against the divorce. His theological writings proved important in the Council of Trent. He was instrumental in the insertion into the oath of Supremacy the phrase, "in so far as the Law of God allows", and was a constant opponent of the royal supremacy. The life and position of Thomas More are well known, and his decline in favor after his refusal to support the royal divorce is sufficiently famous and well documented to require no comment here. The further bond which united More, Fisher, and several other Catholics was the learning and humanism of the circle: More's association with Erasmus is well known, and Fisher had the largest private library in the England of his time. Both were highly literate and erudite, and fought against contemporary religious abuses. After their executions in 1535, the major defender of the Papalist line was Reginald Pole, certainly in the same Roman Catholic and humanist mould as the two better known and earlier leaders of the Papalist party already mentioned. Soon after More and Fisher's execution, Pole published

6. E. E. Reynolds, Saint John Fisher; Wheathampstead: Anthony Clarke Books, 1972 (revised edition). p. 96, esp. n.3. "It would have been contrary to his known probity to have praised what was his own work, even to satisfy the exigences of courtliness." A complete survey of his work and thought is contained in E. L. Surtz, S.J., The Works and Days of John Fisher; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1967 (2 vols.) .

Pro Ecclesiasticae Unitatis Defensione (1536), censuring the king's conduct, and in response to Gardiner's Oration on True Obedience. He was by that time out of the country; Paul III put him on the committee preparing for the general council, and created him a cardinal after he had been ordained a deacon in 1536. His position and influence throughout his exile stands as a testimony to the continuing presence and influence of the Papalist party in England, even though there were no major figures arguing its positions in England after the departure of Pole. Upon his return to England in November of 1554, he stood as the major ecclesiastical leader of the Papalist party, being ordained to the priesthood on 20 March 1555 and consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury two days later. Other prelates came over to the Papalist side in the reign of Mary, notably Edmund Bonner, the last Bishop of London to die in communion with Rome.

The Anglo-Protestant party stood in sharp contrast to the Papalist party on almost every count. Vigorously defending the royal supremacy, partially because of the advantages which accrued to them by its use, they came more and more under the influence of the continental reformers as the period went on. Beginning with the Act of Supremacy, and particularly in the programs of Thomas Cromwell, this party attempted a political and ecclesiastical settlement on reformed and humanist lines: dissolution of the monasteries, vernacular translations of the Scriptures, etc. The Bishops' Book (The Institution of a Christen Man, 1537) stands

as a valuable source for the theological mind of this group in the early part of the period under consideration in this study. When, on the death of Henry VIII, the Anglo-Protestants took hold of the reins of the Regency, further and more radical changes were made, indicative of the further development of both continental reformers and the further consideration and study of English reformers in the years between the fall of Cromwell and the accession of Edward VI. The attack on the Six Articles, the promulgation of the Two Edwardian Prayer Books, the dissolution of the chantries and validation of clerical marriages, and other acts of the Regency are indicative of characteristic positions of this group. Major figures in this group are Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex and Vicegerent for ecclesiastical affairs until his fall from favor and execution in 1540, and Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was active through the whole period in the movements within the Anglo-Protestant party. His considerations of the Eucharist, and the revision of his thought in an ever increasingly Protestant direction are significant, and will be considered later. The heads of the Regency Council, Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford (1537) and Duke of Somerset (1547), and John Dudley, first Earl of Warwick (1548) and first Duke of Northumberland (1549), also stand out. Somerset's liberal agrarian policy shall be particularly considered later. Thomas Audley, Lord Chancellor under Henry; Nicholas Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury; Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester; Thomas Starkey, and other assoc-

iates of Thomas Cromwell stand out as significant members of this party.

This brings us to the central group of Anti-Papal Catholics. Their distinctive views and membership will be considered more fully in the next section, but a few words ought to be said now in the context of the whole scheme. The Anti-Papal Catholics stand as doctrinally orthodox in theology, supporting such doctrines as transubstantiation, auricular confession, monastic vows, etc., and whose position is set forth in the Six Articles and in the King's Book (in comparison with the Bishops' Book). Yet they follow the royal supremacy, and are vigorous defenders of it against the Papalist allegations. This mediating position between Anglo-Protestantism and Papalism has caused the party to be either lost in the shuffle, or variously interpreted as two-faced, insincere, or worse. In addition to Bishop Gardiner, notable names in this party are Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham; Thomas Howard, Third Duke of Norfolk; and Nicholas Heath, Lord Chancellor (after Gardiner) and Archbishop of York.

None of these parties are hard and fast designations. Over the period from the Act of Supremacy to the death of Gardiner there are many changes back and forth, and it is extremely rare to see a person keep the same theological and political positions and still manage to die in his bed.

By the examination of this three party division, the interplay and delicate operation of the English government becomes clearer.

Henry VIII, for all his faults, was a shrewd political operator, and by playing the Anti-Papal Catholics first against the Papalists and then against the Anglo-Protestants, he gained a measure of stability in the realm. When Henry died, and first one and then the other of the opposing groups came to power, this balance was lost, and England was plunged into religious and political strife. As may be readily apparent, the key to the understanding of the period is an understanding of the Anti-Papal Catholics, and in particular Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Master of Trinity Hall, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, Private Secretary to Cardinal Wolsey and Henry VIII, Privy Councillor to King Henry VIII, and Lord Chancellor under Queen Mary. Yet it is strange that this man has been curiously ignored in the scholarship produced since his death, although he certainly did not want for mention in the invective produced immediately after his death and in the decades following it. It is to the "Forgotten Tudor" and his party that we now turn.

II

Stephen Gardiner stands as both the problem and its solution throughout this period for three reasons. He is not neatly categorized either as a Protestant reformer, although he does argue for the King's title of Supreme Head, even after the death of Henry VIII; nor can he be classified as a Roman Catholic, although he does have many theological positions in common with Papal Catholicism. Gardiner was a shrewd politician, and many of his views and actions were tempered by the exigences of the political situation of the realm. And finally, Gardiner spans the period from before the Act of Supremacy until the return of Papalism in full force under Mary - and manages both to stay in the country and to die in his bed (no mean achievement). It is for these and other reasons that special notice must be given to Gardiner himself and to those who supported him and his positions.

The importance of Stephen Gardiner in this period need not be stressed - just a recitation of his titles and positions is sufficient to indicate his relationship to many of the major figures of the early sixteenth century in England. Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge (1525), Private Secretary to Cardinal Wolsey (1527) and to the King (1529), Bishop of Winchester, the richest see in the Kingdom at the time (1531), Chancellor of the University of Cambridge upon the death of Cromwell (1540), and Lord Chancellor (1553). The public career of Bishop Gardiner was wide-ranging and varied, and he led the conservative forces in church and state

for the almost thirty years between the fall of Wolsey and the return of Reginald Pole. He was a friend of learning in every form, and took great interest especially in promoting the study of Greek at Cambridge. He was, however, opposed to the new method of pronouncing the language introduced by Sir John Cheke, and wrote letters to him and to Sir Thomas Smith on the subject, in which, according to Ascham, he opponents showed themselves better critics, but he the superior genius.¹ In his own household he loved to take in young university men of promise, and many of those whom he thus encouraged became distinguished in later life as bishops, ambassadors, and secretaries of state. His house, indeed, was spoken of by Leland as the seat of eloquence and the special abode of the muses.²

Perhaps no celebrated character of his age has been so abused at the hands of popular historians. That his virtue was not equal to every trial must be admitted, but that he was anything like the morose, narrow-minded bigot he is commonly represented as being, there is nothing whatever to show.³ He has been called ambitious, turbulent, crafty, abject, vindictive, bloodthirsty, and a good many other things besides, not quite in keeping with each other; in addition to which it is roundly asserted by Bishop

1. James A. Muller, Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction (hereinafter cited as Muller, Gardiner); New York: Octagon Books, 1970. p. 122; cf. also pp. 278-279.

2. John Leland, Principium, ac illustrium aliquot et eruditorum in Anglia virorum Encomia, Trophea, Genethliaca, et Epithalamia; London, 1589. 100-101.

3. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 301-303.

Burnet that he was despised by Henry and Mary alike, both of whom made use of him as a tool. How such a mean and abject character submitted to remain five years in prison rather than change his principles is not easily explained; and as to his being despised, we can see that neither Henry nor Mary considered him despicable.⁴ The truth is, there is not a single divine or statesman of the day whose thought and actions were so thoroughly consistent. He was no friend of the Reformation, it is true, but he was at least a conscientious opponent. In doctrine he adhered to the old faith from first to last, while in matters of church policy, the only question for consideration was whether the new laws and ordinances were constitutionally justifiable.

The work on which Gardiner's fame rests to a great extent is his defence of the King's title of Supreme Head of the Church in England, namely, the De Vera Obedientia Oratio.⁵ In addition, he published three other political tracts along the same lines: Si Sedes Illa, or the defence of the execution of Bishop Fisher;⁶ Contemptum Humanae Legis, or a response to Martin Bucer;⁷ and a portion of his Exetasis Testimoniorum, another attack on Bucer.⁸ Of his other works, none deal specifically with political issues, and most center around doctrinal and theological problems, in par-

4. Ibid.

5. September, 1535. cf. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 309-311; Janelle, Obedience, pp. ix, xxv-xxviii, 67-171 (text: Roane ed., 1553).

6. September, 1535. cf. Muller, Gardiner, p. 315; Janelle, Obedience, pp. ix, xxiii, 21-65 (text).

7. 1541. cf. Muller, Gardiner, p. 315; Janelle, Obedience, pp. xlviii-1, 173-211 (text).

8. May, 1548. cf. Muller, Gardiner, p. 314; Janelle, Obedience, pp. xvi n.2, xlv.

ticular the Eucharist (five works, two against Cranmer),⁹ with assorted treatises on other subjects (one on the pronunciation of Greek, one book of Latin poetry and epigrams, and various controversial works covering a variety of subjects). A recent publication of a work purporting to be by Gardiner, entitled A Machiavellian Treatise,¹⁰ is unknown in the catalogue of Gardiner's works, was rejected as spurious by James A. Muller,¹¹ is nowhere mentioned in general literature on Gardiner in the reign of Mary, and in its content would appear to be far too blundering for a skillful diplomat like Gardiner. This study shall concentrate on Gardiner's political works, and those portions of his Eucharistic writings which pertain to the controversial literature of the period.

In searching for the distinguishing features of Anti-Papal Catholicism in Tudor England, we shall first study the major points of the writings of Bishop Gardiner, political and religious in turn, and then turn to see which leaders in particular were associated with Gardiner and constituted the party of Anti-Papal Catholics in the period under consideration.

Two of Gardiner's major political treatises were written in the first period under consideration (1535-1540), namely, the De

9. A Detection of the Devils Sophistrie (1546); In Petrū Martyrem florentinum malae tractacionis querela Sanctissimae Eucharistiae (1549); A Discussion of Mr. Hopers oversight ... (1550); An explicatio and assertion of the true Catholique fayth (contra Cranmer, 1551); and Confutatio Cavillationum (contra Cranmer, pseudonymously published in Louvain, 1552). cf. below, in consideration of controversy.

10. Peter S. Donaldson (tr. and ed.) A Machiavellian Treatise by Stephen Gardiner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

11. In a letter to Pierre Janelle, 19 January 1933. ETS Archives.

Vera Obedientia, and the defence of the execution of Bishop Fisher (Si Sedes Illa). Along with the De vera differentia regiae potestatis et ecclesiasticae, attributed to Edward Fox (1534),¹² and the Oration of Richard Sampson (1534).¹³ The godfather of these attempts was Marsiglio of Padua, in his Defensor Pacis (1324).

What F. L. Baumer has called the "cult of authority" of Henry VIII found in these writings its poignant expression and extension.¹⁴ Gardiner's comment that God "hath set princes, whom, as representatives of his Image unto men, he would have to be reputed in the supreme and most high room, and to excel among all other human creatures" was consistently, if not persuasively, unfolded for the spiritual as well as the temporal realm.¹⁵

Henry's break with Rome required theological and political backing, and the three treatises mentioned above (Gardiner, Sampson, and Fox) were an attempt to furnish that. Gardiner's De Vera Obedientia, the longest, most involved, and to a certain extent the most successful attempt, stands out as the greatest theological argument. Gardiner was by training a lawyer, not a theologian, and was so reputed among his contemporaries. Yet in the De Vera Obedientia, most of his arguments are taken from Scripture, and

12. Translated by Henry Stafford, The true differens between the regail power and the ecclesiasticall power (London, 1548).

13. Richard Sampson, Oratio qua docet, hortatur, admonet omnes, potissimum Anglos, regiae dignitati cum primis ut obediant, quia verbum Dei praecipit, Episcopo Romano ne sint audientes (London, 1534); reprinted in J. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1822, Volume I (2), pp. 162-175.

14. Franklin Le Van Baumer, The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. pp. 85ff.

15. Ibid.

are theological, rather than the more political arguments of the others. Drawing his examples from the Davidic Kingship, he contends that the royal supremacy is no new thing. In the Old Testament the high priest was subject to the king; in the New, Christ expressly renounced all claim to earthly rule. Gardiner nowhere contests the Petrine primacy among the apostles, but contends that Peter was chief among the Apostles because he was foremost a preacher and teacher in defence of the truth.

The doctrine that the king receives his authority from God was Gardiner's starting point. This doctrine was the peculiar contribution of the New Learning to political and ecclesiastical theory. The men of the Renaissance found in Roman Law the emperor as the source of all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as secular;¹⁶ they discovered in the Old Testament that kings were the Lord's annointed; they read in Saint Paul an unqualified approval of civil power.

Gardiner, however, asserts the pre-eminence of the Bishops of Rome in the early Church (which none of his more Protestant allies in this venture did). But as for the present Roman Bishops' claim to be successors of Peter and those early Bishops of Rome, Gardiner curtly remarks, "I would he were!" and shows that Peter's

16. These men of the Renaissance included, besides Marsiglio of Padua (cf. above); Egidius Romanus (De Regimine Principum, 1473), Giovanni Pontano (De Principe, XV saec.), Philip Beroaldo (De Optimo Statu et Principe, XV saec.), Francesco Patrizi (De Regno et Regis Institutione, 1518), and Antonio de Guevara (Relox de Principes, 1529).

supremacy consisted in a more plenteous endowment of grace, that he might be "the ringleader in virtue," and fight "like a tall fellow for the defence of truth. Because he was bidden to confirm his brethren in faith, was it given him to bear rule over his brethren?"¹⁷ Gardiner frankly admits that the early Bishops of Rome did maintain moral and spiritual pre-eminence which was gladly recognized by the world, but which gives them no right to political power or to power over the Church than the pre-eminence of a physician gives him a right to rule the commonwealth or even to dictate to others of his own profession. Moreover, the physician retains his pre-eminence only so long as he surpasses all other physicians in learning and skill. The Roman claim to supremacy is like a lame man claiming to be a champion runner because his ancestors were.

In times past the Church of Rome was supreme in preaching God's word, "in the cure and charge of advancing Christ's name ... in prompt valiantness of mind to defend truth, and to keep the faith of Christ from heresies."

The Bishops of Rome, yea, and almost none but they, at the first beginning of the spring of the Church, were diligent to heal the furor of tyrants raging against Christian people.

No man ought, I say, to think it any marvel though the glorious name of the Church of Rome, being at that time famous in excellent virtue, drawing and

17. f. 25b. Janelle, Obedience, p. 137.

alluring almost all parts of the world into admiration of it for virtue's sake ... knit all men to it, and caused the Church, whom all men might see so notably virtuous, to be revered¹⁸ as the chief and principal church among others.

If the Bishop of Rome sought today this kind of supremacy, there is not, says Gardiner, a Christian prince but would do him honor.

There are two further arguments in the De Vera Obedientia which are found in none of the other major defences of the royal supremacy, and which indicate characteristics of the Anti-Papal Catholics. First, in the early part of the book, he touches incidentally on the divorce (as an illustration of obedience!), saying that Henry, in putting away Catherine according to the commands of Scripture, had "obeyed God and obeyed truly."¹⁹

He ends with an answer to the charge that he has broken his oath to the Pope, pointing out that it is a recognized principle of both Civil and Canon Law "that no man is bounden to perform an unlawful oath." Gardiner is perhaps one of the few clergymen of stature to defend the royal supremacy, and as such it is not surprising that his is the only defence to take into consideration the oath to the Pope. He was sincere, he says, in taking the oath to the Pope, but since he has been convinced of its unlawfulness, he can hardly be urged to keep it, "unless we must be persuaded that constancy is commendable in naughty and perverse matters."²⁰

18. f. 30a. Janelle, Obedience, p. 150f.

19. f. 8b. Janelle, Obedience, p. 86.

20. f. 34a. Janelle, Obedience, p. 162.

The treatise in defence of the execution of Bishop Fisher (Si Sedes Illa) is of a different sort than the Oration on True Obedience. It is weak at many points, though it is similar in outline. It is uneven in its consideration and rhetoric. After a short theoretical consideration of truth and obedience (also found in the De Vera Obedientia), Gardiner proceeds to what is basically a canonical and civil defence of the right of rulers to demand unconditional submission to sovereignty. Fisher "resisted his prince and God's commandment (of obedience) against all law as well divine as human."²¹ Yet in this treatise there is no doctrinal novelty, no Protestant turn of phrase.²² In a sense, it is an appeal from one prince to another. But in another sense, it is a bitter satire against the abuses of the Roman Church, from the very first sentence: "If that See which for some time has usurped for itself the name and appellations of sanctity had showed in acts or deeds even the appearance of holiness ..."²³ Here again, the whole trend and thrust of the work is different than other contemporary tracts on the royal supremacy. It cites the abuses of the Roman Church, but neither the same abuses nor as many as in other tracts - it suggests that minor repairs would eliminate the need for a painful break rather than a full scale Reformation.²⁴

21. f. 170b. Janelle, Obedience, p. 46.

22. in the Latin text - the English translator in a few places added portions not in the Latin to give it a more Protestant ring. Gardiner himself never supervised or authorized an English translation. cf. Janelle, Obedience, pp. xxii-xxiv; "The translator was obviously no match for Gardiner's classical scholarship."

23. f. 154a. Janelle, Obedience, p. 22.

24. cf. Janelle, Obedience, pp. xiv-xv.

Nowhere in either the De Vera Obedientia or in the tract on the execution of Bishop Fisher is there complaint or criticism on doctrinal grounds of the establishment of the Church. Since the writer is himself a bishop, the standard anticlericalism of the period is not surprisingly absent, and long passages on the abuses of the clergy are nowhere to be seen. The argument is carried on a theoretical and theological level for the most part, with references being to scripture, law and philosophy. Gelasian dualism is rejected, but there remains to the Church considerable amounts of its previous power and prerogatives, purged from papal abuses and enormities. Gardiner criticized Cromwell often for advocating absolute monarchy,²⁵ and in the two treatises under consideration here he plainly limits the powers of the king, even though he places the king as Supreme Head of the Church in England.²⁶ In many letters, Gardiner cited precedents to show that the king's will was always subordinate to statute and common law. Chancellor Audley once said, he wrote to the Privy Council, that he had never heard of any act of parliament being broken, until the same had by like authority of parliament been repealed.²⁷ Judges and lawyers had consistently maintained that the king may not command against an act of parliament, and that subjects may not break the law even with the king's consent. For example, Cardinal Wolsey obtained his

25. Letter to Somerset, October 14, 1547, in Gardiner, Letters, p. 399.

26. "By this form of government you be established, and it is agreeable with the nature of your people." ibid.

27. Letter to the Privy Council, 30 August 1547, in Gardiner, Letters, pp. 369-370.

legacy from Rome at Henry VIII's request, but he was nevertheless convicted of praemunire by the judges because his action was against the laws of the realm.²⁸ And although those who spoke against Anne Boleyn in parliament did so at the king's special behest, they were obliged to sue for pardon "because that speaking was against an act of parliament."²⁹ The anonymous tract A treatise provynge by the kynges lawes, that the byshops of Rome, had never ryght to any supremitie within this realme (London, 1538) also stands within this tradition and form of argument, but these three tracts stand out as the only major examples of Catholic writing in defence of the royal supremacy in the period 1535-1540.

After the death of Cromwell, the literature concerning the royal supremacy dwindles, probably because of the passage of time since the Act of Supremacy. The only work of Gardiner which deals with the issue at any length is the Contemptum Humanae Legis,³⁰ his response to Martin Bucer in 1541, which primarily deals with the disciplinary rights of the sovereign over the Church. Gardiner's controversy with Bucer, however, soon moved on to other issues, so that in the period which followed, most of Gardiner's works against Bucer dealt with such issues as clerical celibacy and the Eucharist.

Obedience, Gardiner states in his Contemptum Humanae Legis,

28. Letter to Somerset, 14 October 1547, in Gardiner, Letters, p. 390.

29. Letter to Sir John Godsalue, c. 12 September 1547, in Gardiner, Letters, p. 377. The act of parliament referred to is the first Act of Succession (25 Hen. VIII, c. 22), by which act the crown was entailed upon Henry's children by Anne Boleyn, and it was made high treason "by writing, print, deed, or act" to do anything to the prejudice of the Boleyn marriage (C. H. Williams, English Historical Documents; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1971. pp. 452-456.).

30. cf. p. 21 (above), n. 7.

is one of the forms of charity. One of the reasons for the withdrawing of the kingdom from the Pope's jurisdiction in De Vera Obedientia is that the king must fulfil his office as guardian of the people's virtue. Here, in the Contemptum, he no less forcibly affirms that not even the prince is trusted with the moral guidance of the people, that it would be mere impudence on his part to proceed against sin as such, and that the sword placed in his hand need be wielded only against disturbers of social order and public peace. His proper part is to hold together human society, not to avenge God's offences. In this respect, Gardiner's political thought is strikingly akin to the De Vera Obedientia, with the exception that not a word is here said about the Papacy, and that the prince's sovereignty over the Church is taken for granted. In this treatise, Gardiner also asserts that not only is positive law a derivative of natural law and divine law, but that it is also essentially an "interpretation" or legitimate extension of the latter. In answer to Bucer's declaration that there is nothing left for princes to legislate about, since everything is contained in divine law, Gardiner rejoined that everything is contained in Scripture "implicitly", but not "explicitly". Whatever is good or bad, he said, is prescribed in general by divine law, but human law, taking its example from the Scriptures, may prescribe specific things "according as they appear good or bad in their very use and performance."³¹ We find in the Contemptum, if not an actual political

31. p. 268. Janelle, Obedience, p. 200.

theory, supported by a regular array of arguments, at least a clear expression of Gardiner's political temperament, both in regard to the Church and the State. For all that he may have transferred his allegiance from one power to another, he remains a believer in obedience for its own sake, as the necessary corollary of the principle of authority. Therefore "disobedience is the greatest and most infamous crime, which carries with it many other faults, and opens a door to all profligacy."³² Resistance to oppression is unlawful; only in extreme cases, when the subject is directly commanded to infringe God's commandments, has he a right to disobey; but then he must patiently bear the torments inflicted on him. Thus pushing to an extreme some of the principles of the New Testament, Gardiner can feel little sympathy with what we now call the democratic spirit. His final summary will appear as especially striking: the people must not even be told that they are "entrusted to the prince's fostering care and protection", lest they be tempted to inquire how the prince performs the part which God has assigned to him.³³ The inconsistencies and differences which appear when the De Vera Obedientia and the Contemptum Humanae Legis are compared may very well be only apparent, and not real: one is an oration, the other an occasional treatise; one written against Catholic opponents, the other against Protestant; one written to establish

32. p. 258. Janelle, Obedience, p. 181.

33. p. 271. "Haec judicent qui religionem bona fide curant." Janelle, Obedience, p. 206.

the royal supremacy while yet a novelty, the other written to define more clearly its implications after its functioning for almost a decade.

After Henry's death Gardiner treated of the royal supremacy only once more at any length, in his Exetasis Testimoniorum, written in 1548, in which he deals briefly with the divine power of kings and the question of obedience.³⁴ The whole treatise itself is a defence of clerical celibacy, against Martin Bucer, which (while written in 1548) remained unpublished until 1554.³⁵ In the Exetasis, much of the consideration revolves around exception to Bucer's calumny. Gardiner devotes those pages, in which he considers the political issue of obedience, primarily to refuting Bucer's criticism of the Contemptum Humanae Legis. Gardiner's literary output in the period of Edward's reign shifts to theological treatises (primarily the Eucharistic controversy with first Hooper and then Cranmer) and some literary verses and Latin and Greek proverbns with some 79 lines of verse on the name of Jesus (alas, still in manuscript).³⁶

The major scholarly question which remains on Gardiner's views on the royal supremacy is concerning his activities in the reign of Mary, and the so-called Palinodium of the De Vera Obedientia

34. pp. 155-158. (Louvain, 1554).

35. The printer, in his 1554 preface, stated that he withheld it from publication for fear that it might cause the author some trouble, who at the time was committed to the Fleet.

36. MSS. C.C.C.C. 127, pp. 167-190 and 191-342. cf. Muller, Gardiner, p. 316.

Oratio. The issue of Gardiner's views on the royal supremacy after Mary's accession will be considered later, but there is now general agreement that there is no document entitled Palinodium in which Gardiner retracts his De Vera Obedientia, but rather that it is a reference in a letter from Cardinal Pole (in Italian) to a sermon which Gardiner delivered shortly after the absolution of the realm.³⁷ The sermon itself is no longer extant, and it is nowhere else mentioned, neither is there any trace in Gardiner's correspondence of a sermon on this subject.

In mediaeval times the Church had represented the ultimate unity of life. Conscience and the king were both, in the last resort, subject to the Church. But with the renewed study of Biblical and Roman antiquity, scholars were led to conclude that the king was superior to both conscience and the Church. Men as widely divergent as Gardiner and Cranmer found common ground in their support of the royal supremacy. By a strange irony the new learning fathered a second principle which became the mortal foe of this one, a principle latent in the words of Saint Paul and of his greater Master, namely, that the individual conscience is superior to Church and king - a principle which the settled, conservative forces of society have, from that age to this, found dangerous; and today, when most men have given up even the dream

37. The Dictionary of National Biography lists among Gardiner's works, a Palinodia Libri de Vera Obedientia, which Muller suggests probably rests on Pits' inaccurate list of Gardiner's works (Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis, 748-749, Paris, 1619). cf. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 311, 316.

that either Church or king should represent our supreme sanction, we are still striving to co-ordinate conscience with social organization, and seeking an arbiter between them.

To broaden our consideration of the distinctive political characteristics of Anti-Papal Catholicism beyond Gardiner's literary output, various political and diplomatic considerations are useful. Gardiner was, first and foremost, a lawyer and diplomat, skilled in both the law of the Church and the law of princes. Yet in the pursuit of diplomacy, the message is unclear. Even as he was writing the De Vera Obedientia, the Bishop of Faenza wrote to the Papal secretary that Gardiner was "most desirous of his king's returning to the right road, and he made his book under compulsion, not having strength to suffer death patiently."³⁸ Faenza does not say where he gathered this information. At the same time Faenza spoke of Gardiner's desire to bring England back into the Papal fold, Gardiner himself was endeavoring to induce the French king to renounce the Papacy on condition of English aid against the Emperor.³⁹ At the same time he wrote to the Imperial ambassador at the French court that England had no intention whatever of helping Francis against Charles.⁴⁰

Statements of this sort were Gardiner's stock in trade as a diplomat and cannot be taken too seriously. There appears to be

38. Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII (hereinafter cited as L. P.), ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R. H. Brodie. 21 vols. London, 1862-1910. Vol. X, p. 570.

39. L. P., Vol. X, pp. 374-375.

40. L. P., Vol. X, pp. 576, 823.

no clear favoritism of any particular foreign power this period (1535-1555), though it must be admitted that most Anti-Papal Catholic sources were displeased by Mary's marriage to Philip, and were never really friendly to Spain in the first place. Gardiner was most often in favor of Germany against France, but when the German princes offered a set of articles to Henry as a basis for doctrinal uniformity, Gardiner hedged.⁴¹ None of Henry's Catholic supporters and apologists were, in the Catholic sense, internationalists.⁴²

A second area of controversy is the matter of Henry's choice of a regency council. Scarisbrick, in his biography of the King, gives a detailed account of the last days of Henry VIII and the discussion of the Regency Council and its composition, and in particular, the omission of Bishop Gardiner's name.⁴³ His whole account, however, is taken from Foxe, who is by and large not a very reliable source either for Gardiner's character or for anyone's dealings with the Bishop of Winchester.⁴⁴ A view of the Council itself is instructive. The Council appointed in Henry's will for the Regency was by no means entirely Protestant: Cranmer, Hertford and Lisle, the leading Protestants, were balanced by Wriothesley,

41. cf. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 66-67; Gilbert Burnet, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1865 (2d edition). Volume VI, p. 150.

42. cf. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 19, 51-52, 70-73.

43. J. J. Scarisbrick, Henry VIII; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968. pp. 488-491.

44. Though on the whole, Foxe's account has been exonerated from most charges of bias, his attitude toward Gardiner makes it difficult to argue "scholarly detachment" or correctness. After all, Gardiner's first name was not "wily", no matter how often Foxe uses it that way.

Tunstall, and Sir Anthony Browne, who were Catholics (in the theological sense). The majority are hard to identify on either side. What swung the balance, and created the effect of a Protestant Regency Council, was not any decision by Henry, but the fact that in the absence of Norfolk and Gardiner the Protestants were the stronger members, and the key neutrals, Russell and Paget, chose to side with them. England was then left with a Protestant Regency Council, and a Protestant king as well, since Edward's tutors, who were probably chosen by Catherine Parr, were giving him strong Protestant sympathies. One of the copies of Henry's will does have Bishop Gardiner's name erased from the list of members of the Regency Council,⁴⁵ and Norfolk was still in high disfavor and suspicion of treason, but the problem may very well remain insoluble whether, first, Henry intended a Protestant Regency Council (which would, from the makeup, appear doubtful), or second, whether he removed Gardiner's name himself (which is, in the final event, unanswerable). In the final estimation, the exclusion of a powerful Anti-Papal Catholic, like Gardiner, led to a Protestant Regency Council. How the exclusion of Gardiner, who at one time was included, was accomplished, we may only at this point con-
 jec-

Foxe's sources in this particular case were the depositions against Gardiner at the Bishop of Winchester's trial four years later. On the same page Foxe relates two other incidents concerning Gardiner in the latter days of Henry VIII which are undoubtedly apocryphal. (Foxe, Acts and Monuments, Vol. V, 691).

45. L. P., Vol. XXI, ii, 634. cf. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 141-142, and A. F. Pollard, England under Protector Somerset; London: Russell and Russell, 1966. pp. 3ff.

ture.

Gardiner's trials throughout the reign of Edward VI were not primarily political, but rather theological and doctrinal. Yet one of his constant defences against the accusation of adherence to the old religion was that he had authored an attack on the Papacy (the De Vera Obedientia), and had consistently defended it after its publication.⁴⁶ The political ferment of Edward's reign, in particular the various revolts which accompanied the first Prayer Book, seems to be unconnected with the party of Anti-Papal Catholics. Indeed, more than one author has suggested that the revolt in the North resulted from the vacuum caused by the fall of Norfolk, thus leaving the area around Northumberland without a strong and effective leader to keep order.⁴⁷ By Edward's accession, the issue of the royal supremacy has cooled, and the number of treatises considering that doctrine has dwindled - indeed, the major objection to the Anti-Papal Catholics from the Anglo-Protestants in power is not political, but theological: "adherence to the old religion."

The final political question to be considered is that of the significance of the absolution of the realm and its accompanying political consequences after the accession of Mary. Those whom we have been considering as Anti-Papal Catholics (enumerated below)

46. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 198-200, 374-375.

47. A. G. Dickens, The English Reformation (hereinafter referred to as Dickens, Reformation); New York: Schocken Books, 1964. p. 221; G. R. Elton, Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558 (hereinafter referred to as Elton, Reform); Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977. p. 348.

remained in the country, and appeared to have little or no outward trouble in adjusting to the reaction back to Rome. Despite anonymous Protestant attempts to embarrass them,⁴⁸ that group of Anti-Papal Catholics which had previously defended the royal supremacy did not vary significantly or publicly retract any of their previous statements. In addition, many of those who were soon to receive ecclesiastical preferment in Mary's reign had risen since the events of the Reformation Parliament and had escaped involvement in the controversial literature of the period, concentrating rather on other issues. The related issue of the Spanish marriage and alliance should be briefly noted. The marriage was not popular in many circles during the period of its consideration and negotiation, and in the governmental circles of Anti-Papal Catholicism there was opposition too, though there was no agreement over who exactly she should marry instead. Conrad Russell states the paradox as follows:

She had to marry someone, if she did not want her policy to cease with her death, but though she has generally been criticized for marrying the wrong man, it is hard to see who the right man might have been. ... Like her sister after her, Mary could expect to find almost universal opinion in favour of her marriage, and almost equally universal protests against any candidate she chose. Neither her sister nor Mary Queen of Scots found⁴⁹ the problem of marriage any easier than she did.

48. In particular, by the reprinting of various apologies for the royal supremacy, notably the English translation of the De Vera Obedientia with the original preface by Bonner in 1553 (the "Rome" and "Roane" editions; cf. Muller, Gardiner, pp. 309-311).

49. Conrad Russell, The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509-1660 (hereinafter referred to as Russell, Crisis); New York: Oxford University Press, 1971. pp. 137f.

On another level, the question of the marriage degenerated into a squabble between Gardiner and Paget within the Council, in the end concerning conciliar leadership. Heath is really the only neutral, and sooner or later the Council takes sides, with the result that Gardiner gained the ascendancy. As Cromwell's protege, Paget deplored Gardiner's administrative methods, but both shared a concern for good government. Above all, both men were loyal and unselfish servants of the Crown: a crucial similarity which is obscured by those who have emphasized factionalism.

The traditional view of conciliar factions in Mary's reign derives from two sources. One is Pollard's portrayal of Gardiner as the religious zealot and Paget as the politique. The other is Harbison's description of two fairly well defined factions, in which Gardiner led Mary's Household servants,

most of them devoted Catholics and few of them possessed of any political experience. Gardiner's zealous interest in restoring the old religion, his narrow legalism, and his honest patriotism were characteristic of the group, as was also his lack of finesse and flexibility in political matters. The other faction, led by William, Lord Paget, a shrewd and supple homme nouveau who managed to get on well with four successive sovereigns, consisted of the nobles and civil servants who felt they had a natural right to govern the country.⁵⁰

This interpretation, which describes the maneuvering of the wily

50. Albert F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth; New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1910. pp. 113-115; Elmore H. Harbison, Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. pp. 61-62

Renard, his ally Paget, and Gardiner, resulting in governmental confusion and the eventual breakdown of the conciliar system of government, seems to overlook a major point. Gardiner and Paget shared a devotion to the Tudor dynasty which, because of the pre-occupation with their political rivalry, has been overlooked. Although there were major differences over the marriage decision, a serious rebellion, and a tumultuous parliament, the issues were resolved. The marriage took place peacefully in July of 1554, and in November Mary's most tractable parliament joyfully received Cardinal Pole, who reconciled England to Rome. The Council had served the Queen well, and the Marian Council was much stronger and more cohesive than traditional interpretations would lead us to believe. The reason for the success of the Marian Council, hampered by the ineffectiveness of the monarch, can be found in the basic loyalty of the members to the regular order of succession. This accounts both for the transition and acceptance of the reconciliation with Rome by the same people who had earlier decried it, but also in some way accounts for the reason why the Cromwellian system of government, designed with a strong adult ruler in mind, more than survived two weak Tudor rulers. Its strength throughout the Tudor period can now be affirmed, and it now seems appropriate to characterize the theme of its operation under the Anti-Papal Catholics at the beginning of Mary's reign as one of co-operation rather than of conflict. And the bond which accounts for both the acceptance of the reconciliation and the co-operation in the fun-

ctioning of the government is the desire for stability and regularity of the succession and its government, an hallmark of the Anti-Papal Catholic position from its inception.

Having considered some of the political characteristics and positions of Anti-Papal Catholicism in general, and Stephen Gardiner in particular, we now turn to the religious positions maintained by the group over the same period. This is easier to assess, both because the sources are clearer and more abundant, as well as because the religious positions are by and large more consistent over the period than the political maneuvering suggests.

The earliest identifiable divergence between Gardiner and the Papalists is over the royal supremacy, which is a theological and religious difference as well as a political question. The religious basis of the royal supremacy can be studied for further clarification of the issues in question.

It is important to notice, that for all their redefinition, the Henrician apologists did not abandon the principle of Gelasian dualism altogether. Although they redefined the words "spiritual" and "temporal" in Marsilian terms, and although they deprived the spirituality of its potestas jurisdictionis, they nevertheless reserved to the latter a narrow sphere within which it was supreme, unmolested by secular encroachments. This sphere was the potestas ordinis, the power of conferring grace through consecration and the Sacraments, which they consistently opposed including in the royal supremacy. They denied, in contradistinction to med-

iaeval Gelasianism, that the clergy had been given powers of coercive jurisdiction by God, but they refrained from repudiating the mediaeval scheme altogether. They rather refined it in their own words and then gave it their blessing. The king, or the king in parliament, they said in effect, is supreme administrator of the Church, but he is not a priest ex officio. He must not interfere with the potestas ordinis which the clergy hold jure divino. The Anglo-Protestant party did not make this exception after the preliminary pamphlets, so that Archbishop Cranmer answered equivocally when asked whether any other than a bishop may make a priest,⁵¹ and for the most part he seems to have thought that the king might assume a kind of potestas ordinis. He is certain that a priest or bishop need not be consecrated if he has been duly elected and appointed.⁵²

Beside this difference between Cranmer and other Anglo-Protestant apologies and the Anti-Papal Catholic apologies for the royal supremacy on the issue of potestas ordinis, there is also a more subtle difference in the basis and sources quoted. The Anglo-Protestant apologists (Starkey and St. German in particular) by and large rely upon the Marsilian arguments, and on the concept of adiaphora lately become popular. Their use of scripture is

51. Gilbert Burnet, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England (hereinafter cited as Burnet, History); Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1865. (7 vols., 2d edition). Vol. IV, p. 475. Cranmer successfully dodges this question. He reads the word "make" as "elect", and therefore comes to the obvious conclusion that often in the past princes have "made" bishops.

52. Ibid., pp. 468, 478. Just what Cranmer implies by this assertion

moulded by their discoveries and advances in the new learning, and their use of other sources is minimal. On the other hand, Anti-Papal Catholic apologies almost universally begin with a theoretical consideration of obedience as the central point of the royal supremacy, and proceed to a consideration of power from there. Their use of Scripture is limited, and almost exclusively limited to citations of examples from the Old Testament and occasional Pauline passages. Janelle reports that Bucer was "thunderstruck" by Gardiner's use of I Corinthians 7.37, that a father might keep his daughter a virgin out of his own freewill, to suggest that the king might forbid marriage.⁵³ Even with regard to content, the Church is treated not as an universal brotherhood of Christians, but reference is made to its supernatural character. Nor indeed does Gardiner anywhere, in his defence of the king's supremacy, contemplate the creation of a national church, independent in its creed and form of worship. He does indeed use the words "Ecclesia anglicana" in one passage of the De Vera Obedientia,⁵⁴ but states quite clearly that it is nothing but the "gathering of the men and women, of the clerks and lay-people dwelling in the kingdom of

however, is not clear. For he says (ibid., p. 468) that "there is no more promise of God that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office." This would seem to indicate that even if royal appointment were sufficient to make a bishop, without the necessity of consecration, even so this would not constitute a potestas ordinis, for by the act of appointment the king would not be conferring grace.

53. Janelle, Obedience, p. xlvii.

54. f. 11b. Janelle, Obedience, p. 94.

England, and united in the profession of Christ."⁵⁵ It is the Church in England, not the Church of England; there is no reason for local developments in belief and practice; each province of Christendom must still remain at one with the others; the common pattern for all is found in the tradition of the Church universal. This is the second doctrinal difference between the Anglo-Protestant and Anti-Papal Catholic apologies for the royal supremacy.

The standard statement of Anti-Papal Catholicism in England during this period (1535-1555) on religious and doctrinal matters, however, is the Act abolishing Diversity in Opinions of 1539 (31 Hen. VIII, c. 14), more generally known as the Act of Six Articles. It stands as such a standard both by the issues considered and the stands taken, as well as by the people who were instrumental in its passage. The articles concerning transubstantiation, communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, monastic vows, private masses, and auricular confession are all defined and enjoined, each of which was a point of contention with the Anglo-Protestants of the period, and each of which was vigorously defended by Catholic writers after the passage of the act. The article on transubstantiation in particular was the cause of much debate, and most of the discipline enforced because of the Act was enforced because of violation of this article. Gardiner himself wrote works

55. Ibid.

dealing primarily with clerical celibacy and the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, and each of the articles became the subject of a growing controversial literature. It shall suffice at this point to mention the place of the Act in the general sweep of the period, for it stands as one of the more concise statements of the characteristic positions of this party on the controversial issues of the period. We shall consider the position on transubstantiation in greater detail under the discussion of the Eucharistic controversies between Gardiner and Cranmer in the reign of Edward VI.

Added to the Act of Six Articles and its enforcement, and published not long after it in 1543, was The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man (The King's Book), which stands as a closer and fuller exposition of many of the stands taken in the Act of Six Articles. Called The King's Book from the preface by Henry VIII, it is a revision of an earlier and more Protestant (if only by omission) version, known as The Bishops' Book. The King's Book was thought to be not essentially a revision, but a rewriting of the earlier work under the direction of four bishops - Archbishop Cranmer, along with Gardiner, Heath and Thirlby.⁵⁶ Seeing the composition of the commission, and coming soon after

56. The King's Book or A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, 1543; ed. T. A. Lacey. London: S.P.C.K., 1932. p. xix. The edition of the text is a photographic reprint of Bishop Charles Lloyd's edition of Formularies of Faith put forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII (Oxford, 1825), p. 213 to the end.

the execution of Thomas Cromwell, it is no wonder that it is both conservative and doctrinally orthodox.

The section on the Lord's Supper, the shortest of the considerations of the seven sacraments in The Bishops' Book, was considerably lengthened in The King's Book. Both the Real Presence and transubstantiation were expounded in line with the Six Articles. After the consideration of the Paternoster and the Ave Maria, The Bishops' Book had included a section "Of Prayer for Souls Departed" and "The Article of Justification". The former was renamed "The Article of Purgatory" in The King's Book, significant in itself, and was expanded to include a denial of authority to grant indulgences and an affirmation of the efficacy of masses for the dead. The article on justification was entirely rewritten, and two additional articles were included in The King's Book, not present in The Bishops' Book, namely, "The Article of Good Works", and "The Article of Free Will". A section on the Ave Maria (called "The Salutation of the Angel" in The King's Book) was shortened before inclusion in The King's Book, as a passage on the Name of Mary was eliminated (which called her name "the highest name, that can be in any creature" and compares Mary with the protomartyr Stephen and his form of address in Acts 6). There are other differences, most minor, between the two books, but the progression should be obvious. In the composition of the four bishops who worked on the revision, in the King's work on the book himself and in his preface, and in the general climate and enforcement of the Act of Six Articles, The King's Book stands as

the major work which expounds the doctrinal understanding and justifications for the statements included in the Six Articles, and gives a brief but thorough exposition of the major points of faith.

The next major theological controversy between the parties was the Prayer Book Controversy in 1548. One of the effects of Gardiner's work on sacramental theology was incitement to further revision. On his first examination of the Prayer Book in 1548, Gardiner told Somerset and the other councillors that although he would not have made it what it was, nevertheless he liked it because it taught the Catholic faith concerning the Sacrament. He appealed to it against Hooper. He did so against Cranmer also. It was one of his strongest tactical positions, for the Prayer Book was largely of Cranmer's composition, and was, moreover, the official liturgy of the church of which Cranmer was primate.

Gardiner pointed to five points in the Communion Service, which, he said, explicitly upheld Catholic doctrine. First, the words of distribution ("The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee ... The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee ...") made clear the teaching of the Church that the Body and Blood were present under the form of bread and wine, and not, as Cranmer said, only in them that worthily ate and drank the bread and wine. Second, the rubric providing for the division of each wafer into at least two pieces and explaining that "men must not think less to be received in part than in the

whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour," was, said Gardiner, "agreeable to Catholic doctrine." Third, the words in the prayer of consecration, "with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ," taught that "the body of Christ is by God's omnipotency ... made present unto us at such time as the Church prayeth it may please him so to do." Fourth, the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church (which in the first Prayer Book contained petitions for the dead as well as the living, and was placed in immediate connection with the consecration) was very consonant with the belief in the Sacrament as a sacrifice propitiatory for the sins of the world, for when Christ gives Himself in the Supper as a sacrifice for our sins "it is very profitable at that time ... to remember in prayer all estates of the Church." Fifth, in the prayer now known as the Prayer of Humble Access (which in the first Prayer Book stood after the consecration and immediately before the Communion) "the adoration of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament ... is," said Gardiner, "in my judgement, well set forth."⁵⁷

The holy mystery of the Sacrament, he concluded, "in the Book of Common Prayer is well termed, not distant from the Catholic

57. An explicatio and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed Sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. (in Parker Society, Writings and Disputations ... Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper of Thomas Cranmer, ed. J. E. Cox. Cambridge, 1844. pp. 51, 55, 62, 79, 83, 84 bis, 92).

Faith in my judgement"; and he declared that "the effect of all celestial or worldly gifts to be obtained of God in the celebration of Christ's Holy Supper ... shall be obtained, if we devoutly, reverently, charitably, and quietly use and frequent the same, without other innovations than the order the book prescribeth."⁵⁸

Most of the Anti-Papal Catholics subscribed to the 1549 Prayer Book in general as it stood. Bishop Thirlby objected that the book omitted the elevation, "wherein is considered the doing of it and the end whereof it is done. The necessity of it and end is this, to remember Christ upon the Cross"; and he objected to the omission of the act of adoration, which he supported with citations from Augustine.⁵⁹ Ten bishops all together opposed the Bill of Uniformity and the new liturgy, and thirteen were in favor. The lines were drawn in general along standard doctrinal party lines, though Bishop Thirlby's objection to the new Prayer Book startled many of the observers, the Lord Protector in particular.⁶⁰

A few short comments should suffice for a consideration of doctrinal positions of Anti-Papal Catholics in the reign of Queen Mary. Little, if any, controversial literature was produced during this period in defence of Catholic orthodoxy by Anti-Papal Catholics; indeed, it would not be easy to distinguish such literature from

58. Ibid., pp. 229, 325.

59. T. F. Shirley, Thomas Thirlby, Tudor Bishop; London: S.P.C.K., 1964. p. 99. This portion of the text lacks footnotes or notations of sources.

60. Ibid., pp. 100f.

standard brand Papalism very easily, since the matter of the royal supremacy became a moot point after the restoration of England to the Roman fold. Catholicism which returned with Cardinal Pole from the continent was different from the Catholicism which had persisted under Gardiner, et al., in some respects, but on the issues which had been discussed so vigorously in the past twenty years, there was no longer any major controversy, the Eucharist excepted. Although Gardiner had not directed his last treatise on Eucharistic doctrine specifically against Cranmer, Cranmer began to write a reply to it when he in turn became a prisoner under Queen Mary (poetic justice?). His chief reason, Cranmer said, for desiring to appeal his case to a general council was to gain time to finish his reply before his death; and he wrote his friend Peter Martyr saying that of all his sufferings in prison no thing distressed him more than the thought that one of Gardiner's books was unanswered.⁶¹

The specific differences between Anti-Papal Catholicism and Papalism in Mary's reign will be taken up below, in the consideration of the absolution of the realm.

In summary of the characteristic positions, Anti-Papal Catholicism in Tudor England combined a realistic diplomacy and pragmatic political stance on the political front with a staunch rel-

61. Thomas Cranmer (ed. J. E. Cox), Miscellaneous Writings and Letters (Parker Society); Cambridge, 1846. pp. 455-458; cf. Foxe, Acts and Monuments; Vol. VIII, 35.

igious orthodoxy. To state that the group was Catholic in theology is an oversimplification. To be sure, its hallmarks included defence of transubstantiation, vows, auricular confession, and the whole program expounded in the Six Articles and The King's Book, but they also included a defence of the royal supremacy not merely on political grounds, Roman Law, or historical precedent. Indeed, one of its distinguishing features is the manner in which the supremacy was defended on theological grounds - in contrast to the apologies for the supremacy written from a more Protestant viewpoint.

It remains to see who in particular were the major figures in the Anti-Papal Catholic party during the period from the Act of Supremacy to the death of Bishop Gardiner. The major figure throughout this study heretofore has been Bishop Gardiner himself. He stands as a leader in his own right, both of ecclesiastical and political forces. By training he was a lawyer, not a theologian, and by his training under Wolsey he soon learned that there was a thin line between service of Church and State in sixteenth century England. We have been using him as a standard, both because he was one of the most prolific writers of the period and has left behind a significant amount of treatises and letters (both published and unpublished) with which a study can be made, as well as being an articulate (if not always temperate) spokesman for Anti-Papal Catholicism. Gardiner was, as Henry and Mary both recognized, an indispensable diplomat, a

trained and experienced advisor on foreign affairs - and was the author of the classic defence of the royal supremacy as a part of the Christian Faith.

In the earlier part of the period under consideration, Thomas Howard, third Duke of Norfolk was influential and in a sense the political leader of the party of which Gardiner was the religious leader. His position in the adoption of the Act of Six Articles is well known. Henry VIII had few supporters as loyal as the Duke of Norfolk, and it is significant of the development of patronage that such a powerful noble should be so loyal, even supporting Anne Boleyn (though he was certainly no Protestant himself) because she was his niece. When Henry married another one of Norfolk's kin, Catherine Howard, Norfolk's influence was such that some scholars have credited him with the execution of Cromwell.⁶² Falling from great heights (though not as far as his niece), he still remained loyal to the crown, and was released from the Tower by Mary in time to suppress Wyatt's Rebellion before it did too much damage. Though not very subtle theologically, Norfolk remained both a staunch Catholic and a strong royalist throughout his life and certainly fits the mould of Anti-Papal Catholic if he fits any mould at all.

The list of Anti-Papal Catholics appears to be overwhealmingly

62. Russell, Crisis, p. 120; Elton, Reform, pp. 289, 299-300, where he neatly divides the blame for the fall of Cromwell between the rise of the Howard faction, and "the lust of an aging autocrat."

clerical in most periods. In addition to Gardiner himself, we may include Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London (1539); Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham (1530); Nicholas Heath, Bishop of Rochester (1539; Worcester, 1543; York, 1556) and Gardiner's successor as Lord Chancellor (1555-1558); Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely (1554) and one of Gardiner's closest friends and executor of his will; George Day, Bishop of Chichester (1543) and contributor to The King's Book, along with Gardiner; William Repps, Abbot of Hulme and Bishop of Norwich (1536) and one of Henry's strongest and most consistent supporters; Robert Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle (1538); John Skip, Bishop of Hereford (1539); Dr. Nicholas Wilson, royal chaplain and Henry's confessor; Richard Sampson, Bishop of Chichester (1536); and Cuthbert Scott, Bishop of Chester (1556). Among the non-clerical supporters it is more difficult to categorize leaders, but we may properly include Thomas Wriothesley, Lord Chancellor and first Earl of Southampton; Sir Robert Rochester and Sir Francis Englefield, close friends of Gardiner, his supporters on the Council in Queen Mary's reign, and executors of his will; and also most of the Howard clan. The list, above, is notable for three reasons. First, it is strongly clerical, as already mentioned. This, of itself, need not produce any wonder, especially in that age and period when the clergy were used often as a form of adjunct civil service. Second, most of the bishops were appointed and consecrated after the Reformation Parliament, and all of them that survive are deposed by Elizabeth soon after her accession. Third,

they form a rather compact group that is cohesive throughout the period. The same members vote for the Six Articles and against the new Prayer Book in 1548/9 (with the exception of Bishop Sampson), and in other ways exhibit similar preferences on the votes which are taken in Parliament, exhibiting a consistency rare for the period. The list could be extended by including the more notable Anti-Papal Catholics in the Commons, many of which are described for the period between 1536 and 1547 in Lehmberg's study of the later parliaments of Henry VIII.⁶³

63. Stanford E. Lehmberg, The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII, 1536-1547; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

III

Anti-Papal Catholicism did not develop within a vacuum, but rather must be considered and estimated against the background of the political events of the early sixteenth century in England, and in particular in relation to the two parties which existed and developed along with it. It is to these two parties that we now turn, namely, the Anglo-Protestant and Papalist groups.

That group which I have identified as Anglo-Protestant is not as neatly classifiable as the two other parties under consideration. It encompasses both conservative public servants and administrators under Cromwell involved in the development and growth of the modern English state, as well as scholars and theologians heavily influenced by the new learning, as well as those influenced by the Lutheran (and later Reformed) voices from the continent. This group does not speak with a unified voice, as with a Gardiner (for example), but with many. Indeed, in a later period the group splits into Puritan and non-Puritan factions over some of the issues and differences which even in the early Tudor period promise to cause division and strife in the party itself. Its actions in the reign of Edward VI, going through various phases, becoming more and more radical and less in control of its own members as time went on, presaged a greater difficulty to come in the reign of Elizabeth. Interparty struggle among the Anglo-Protestants came to light in particular among the Marian exiles,

concerning the program to be enacted upon return to England, but even before that time there are differences over issues that threaten to undermine the total program, that aid the Anti-Papal Catholics, and that attract fringe members and various other sorts of visionary and eccentric types of people.

The parties can be defined and differentiated in two major ways: by the personal controversies which took place in church and government in the period under consideration, and by the controversial literature generated by the parties on the issues debated. At times these two merge, as in the case of the literature concerning the Eucharist generated by the conflict between Cranmer and Gardiner in the reigns of Edward and Mary. Philip Hughes notes that in the "last, curious six years of Henry's reign, the two leading personages in public life were bishops, Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner. None of the laymen in the council rise above mediocrity, whether as diplomats or as administrators - nor is any one of them given a chance to show himself the third Wolsey or the second Cromwell."¹ To more clearly define the limits of the Anglo-Protestant and Anti-Papal Catholic controversy, let us look at the Eucharistic controversy and the literature which it engendered.

Gardiner and Cranmer had fought almost continually for the last years of the reign of Henry VIII, Gardiner almost succeeding

1. Philip Hughes, A Popular History of the Reformation; Garden City, New York: Hanover House, 1957. p. 215. Hughes does not say exactly who he considers the second Wolsey to be.

in having Cranmer the Archbishop imprisoned for heresy (although Henry intervened at the last minute). Although not a politician, Cranmer did have influence, and Gardiner was well known (and dangerous enough) at the beginning of Edward's reign to be committed to the Fleet. Confinement, however, brought little abatement in Gardiner's energy. In the five years of his sojourn in the Tower he wrote six volumes of theological controversy, and in odd moments collected Latin proverbs, made excerpts from the Latin poets, and practiced the composition of original Latin verse.² That at least two of the six volumes of divinity were written after his trial, indicates that the order of the Council depriving him of pen and paper was not rigorously enforced.³ The most influential of the reformers against whom he wrote were Hooper and Cranmer.

Hooper had preached at Court during Lent 1550, and Gardiner had at that time desired to dispute with him. The Book of Jonah was Hooper's text, which, on seven successive Wednesdays, he expounded in the light of contemporary conditions. He compared the ship in which Jonah sailed to the ship of State, in which, he said, there were many Jonahs - the conservative clergy not the least among them - who should be cast overboard. At the verse "the people of Nineveh believed God," he took the occasion to speak of the relation of belief to the Sacraments, and devoted the best part of

2. cf. above, p. 32 n. 36.

3. The Exetasis Testimoniorum (cf. above), Muller, Gardiner, p. 314; and the Confutatio Cavillationum; Muller, Gardiner, p. 313.

two sermons to exhibiting the absurdities, as he deemed them, of the doctrine of Christ's bodily presence in the Sacrament of the Altar.

In September of the same year he published these sermons with an introduction in which he advised King Edward VI not to trouble himself when evil men said that "as long as the King is in his tender years the Council should do nothing in matters of religion," and cited Josiah to the contrary. He exhorted the King and Council to remove all the "leavings of papistry," saying, "as ye have taken away the Mass from the people, so take away from them the feathers also: the altar, vestments, and such like." He entitled the volume: An oversight, and deliberation upon the holy Prophet Jonas. Here was uncompromising continental Protestantism of the Zwinglian variety preached by an English bishop, preached before King and Council, and published with the evident approval of those in authority in both Church and State. Three editions were issued in rapid succession. Gardiner might well wonder where the Church in England was headed.

In his reply, Gardiner made merry over the title. The word "oversight", he said, exactly fitted the book. It was filled with oversight. He called his reply A Discussion of Mr. Hooper's oversight where he entreateth among his other Sermons the matter of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, and adorned the title page with the proverb, "Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."

Yet, Gardiner perceived that Hooper's teaching contained more than easily turned arguments against the bodily Presence in the Eucharist. It implied, even if it did not express, a fundamental dissent from the whole Catholic conception of the Church. Said Gardiner,

Mr. Hooper maketh here an insinuation to send every man to seek his communion in heaven, whither he will have each man take his journey when he feeleth himself oppressed with the burden of sin, without seeking help of the ministry of the Church in earth ... I know Christ calleth them to him that be burdened, but yet would therewith have the ministry of the Church regarded, ordering himself to be come unto by his ministers, and by them to forgive sin, and by them to purge, and by them to cleanse, by them to sanctify, and by them to work the edification of the Church, which this teaching of Mr. Hooper doth plainly destroy.

In this passage is expressed more clearly perhaps than in any other writing of Gardiner his sense of the gulf between Catholic and Protestant viewpoints. Hooper's teaching did without doubt destroy the Catholic conception of the Church and of the place and prerogative of the priesthood in it. Possibly this was what Hooper intended to do. Certainly this result was no inconsiderable reason why his teaching found approval among the politically and economically powerful classes of his and subsequent days. Men who understood little of the subtleties of the sacramentarian controversy were ready to embrace a doctrine which, while claiming to

4. A Discussion of Mr. Hooper's oversight, f. 53, in the collection of Muller papers of the ETS Archives. The copy consulted was a transcription of the manuscript copy (unpublished) from the Records Office. The Hooper treatise quoted above is in the Parker Society edition (Vol. I, An Oversight and Deliberation upon the holy Prophet Jonas; Cambridge, 1854. pp. 342, 376.)

be apostolic, tended to free life from clerical control.

In Cranmer, Gardiner found an opponent less radical than Hooper and far more learned, clearer headed and more skillful. Cranmer had, in 1550 - the year in which Hooper's Oversight appeared - published A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament, which to Gardiner seemed neither true nor Catholic. He wrote an immediate reply, which, unlike his book against Hooper, was not merely a refutation of his opponents arguments, but also an exposition of his own "opinion and true belief of the Sacrament of the Altar, and of the true Catholic faith therein." This he presented at the thirteenth session of his trial, 26 January 1551, to the Commissioners at Lambeth "for part of his proof of his matter justificatory," and offered himself "to be ready, at the will and pleasure of the judges, at any time and place convenient, and before a due audience, by learning to defend the said book."⁵

Gardiner was not granted the opportunity to defend his book before a due audience as he desired, but he did succeed in having it published sometime during the year 1551, under the title An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith Touching the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.⁶

Cranmer replied immediately in An Answer ... unto a Crafty

5. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, VI, 134.

6. cf. discussion above. Muller, Gardiner, p. 313.

and Sophistical Cavillation Devised by Stephen Gardiner, in which there reappeared Cranmer's book of 1550, the whole of Gardiner's answer, and Cranmer's rejoinder to this. This volume, as reprinted by the Parker Society, is the form in which the controversy is most readily accessible. Cranmer's arguments are always vigorous and often telling, his English surpasses Gardiner's in clarity and precision, but the reader of the volume must remember that in it Cranmer has the advantage of the last word. It was not, however, the last word of the controversy, for Gardiner published in Paris in 1552 a Latin work on the Sacrament entitled Confutatio Cavillationum ..., under the pseudonym of Marcus Antonius Constantius, Theologian, of Louvain. A second edition was published in his own name at Louvain in 1554, after his release from the Tower. This is a volume of eight hundred pages, over two thirds of which is devoted to answering two hundred and fifty-five objections to the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament; the rest, to a discussion of other phases of the same subject.

The subject matter of this controversy, and its later stages, is beyond the scope of this study. But the issues raised, both in the radical form under Hooper and in the difference between Gardiner and Cranmer on the issues of transubstantiation and the Real Presence point up what is perhaps the major difference between the two parties: the Anglo-Protestant party adhering to various theological doctrines common on the continent, the Anti-Papal Catholics still adhering to the standard Catholic formulations

(especially concerning the Eucharist) found before the Reformation. It is also true that these religious issues, many going back to the late mediaeval division between nominalism and realism, found further political ramifications, in particular among the more radical of the reformers (for example, the doctrine of the Church in Hooper).

The Eucharistic controversy was probably the most well known, protracted, and clearly defined of the controversies which separated the Anglo-Protestants and the Anti-Papal Catholics over the period. Other areas are pointed up in the differences between the Ten Articles and the Six Articles, and secondarily between The Bishops' Book and The King's Book. The Ten Articles contain three sacraments, and in this manner represent a trend in the Protestant direction (if only in what is omitted). When put into The Bishops' Book, the seven sacraments are expounded, but with Matrimony first (in a rather lengthy article). The article on the Eucharist is short, and relatively innocuous. The last two articles of the Ten, on justification and on purgatory, are placed entire in The Bishops' Book in the form in which they were enacted. Here, at an early stage in the controversy, the sides are beginning to be drawn as clearly as possible, in a realm where the King's theological learning and prejudices are relatively well known, and certainly taken very seriously.

In addition, there are some general traits which are noticeable among the Anglo-Protestants to a greater degree than among other

parties. Humanism is valued highly, and although it is not absent among the other parties (Gardiner and Pole themselves, for examples, and More and Fisher stand as examples before the period), it is this party in particular which gives a warm welcome to the new learning, and by their education and control of the royal tutors exhibit a strong influence both in this period and for a long time afterwards. Even such an undissimulated Protestant as Ascham became, at the prompting of none other than Gardiner, Latin Secretary to Queen Mary.⁷ The second general trait was the overwhelming choice of the court and education over the church and business. This can be accounted for to some degree because of the growth and reorganization of government under Cromwell's "sinister" genius, thus furnishing the required patronage and necessary means of advancement for the establishment of and furtherance of members of his school of thought. But beyond that, the growth of Protestantism in England can be tied very heavily even at its inception to the court and the universities, and can be seen to come rather later to the Church. The Supplication of the Ordinaries (1523) and the power and prestige Gardiner had among the English bishops suggests that on the whole the church was not as open to advancement as other areas for Anglo-Protestants.⁸ The third general trait is that of increased communication with the continent. It

7. Muller, Gardiner, p. 278.

8. cf. Russell, Crisis, pp. 93-94; G. R. Elton, The Tudor Constitution; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1960. pp. 324-326.

is not surprising that reformers correspond with reformers, but the volume of correspondence, and the number of trips back and forth by reformers, as well as the welcome received on both ends, suggests that this communication is not incidental, and indeed is greater than the communication with the continental counterparts of the other two parties.

These three general traits, and others, are studied in most literature dealing with the period, and do not need to be elaborated here.⁹ But these three in particular set off the Anglo-Protestant school from the others, and aided its growth and development throughout the period. A view of the scope of controversial literature here is instructive. With the rise of Cromwell after Wolsey's fall, it is no surprise to see that printing and publication by the royal printers turn in a decidedly more Protestant direction. The wave of Protestant literature from the continent as early as 1526 was soon echoed by publication on a rapidly increased scale of English literature dealing with many of the same subjects. With the Act of Supremacy, a new set of apologetic literature was called for, and many Protestant writers leaped to fill the gap. Early on, Sampson's brief Oratio (1534), Edward Fox's De vera differentia regiae potestatis et ecclesiasticae (1534), already

9. In addition to the standard histories of the period, the following are useful studies of the points raised in the last paragraph: J. K. McConica, English Humanism and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI (Oxford, 1965); H. C. Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge, 1958); G. R. Elton, The Tudor Revolution in Government (Cambridge, 1953); idem, Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal (Cambridge, 1973); and N. S. Tiernagel, Henry VIII and the Lutherans: A Study in Anglo-Lutheran Relations from 1521-1548 (St. Louis, Missouri, 1965).

mentioned as two of the three (with Gardiner's De Vera Obedientia) major defences of the supremacy, were soon joined by works of Thomas Starkey, Christopher St. German, and a flood of others. As the issues switched from political to religious in the spectrum being considered, here, too, the literary output increased. The tracts on the Eucharist highlighted earlier are but a small sample of those tracts which defended anything from the suppression of the monasteries to the revision of the Prayer Book (in particular in the wake of the revolts of 1549). The three main areas of this literature were scripture (especially dealing with translation), doctrinal and expository tracts (soon growing into such works as the Book of Homilies, and later on into the various Primers), and controversial literature proper (dealing with occasional subjects such as clerical celibacy, monastic vows, responses to other tracts, Eucharistic doctrine, etc.).

A last area of literature was with regard educational matters, and in particular the matter of the pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge. Gardiner's enforcement of the received pronunciation at Cambridge is perhaps not the best test for Protestantism, but the interest in the issue, an outgrowth of the humanist interest and the new learning, may be a useful standard. In addition to the concern over the pronunciation of Greek, while Gardiner was Chancellor of Cambridge, he often filled his letters to Matthew Parker, his Vice-Chancellor, with references to events at Cambridge which were not conducive to "good order and sound learning." In one

letter of 1545, Gardiner asked for an investigation of a play, Pammachius, which had been acted at Christ College, and which, according to reports he had received, was "soo pestiferous as wer intollerable."¹⁰ This was a Latin tragedy written by Thomas Kirchmeyer, a German Calvinist, in which Pammachius, an imaginary Pope of the fourth century, transfers his allegiance from Christ to Satan, deposes the Emperor, until he is confronted by an indignant Saint Paul (risen from his grave). Needless to say, it gave the actors an opportunity to poke fun at Catholic practices still in use in England. "I wyl withstand fansyes even in pronunciation, and fight with thenemye of quiet at the first entree," wrote Gardiner in 1543.¹¹ Whether or not there is a demonstrable link between Cambridge and the reformers, Gardiner and his party were certainly very wary of events which tended to disturb the status quo at that institution of learning. His main contention was, characteristically, that novelty and innovation on the part of young teachers fostered rashness and vanity in the youth whom they taught. Upon his restoration as Chancellor in 1553, Gardiner proceeded once again to regulate the University, and its pronunciation of Greek, with a more lenient hand,¹² but whether this is due to changed circumstances, or his advancing age, or preoccupation with other matters, is uncertain.

10. Letter to Thomas Smith and Matthew Parker. 27 March 1545, London. Gardiner, Letters, pp. 129-130.

11. Letter to John Edmunds. 15 May 1543, Hampton Court. Gardiner, Letters, p. 122.

12. Gardiner, Letters, pp. 455-458, 474-476.

One last distinction should be pointed out. The term "Anglo-Protestant" is perhaps misleading, but is also more instructive than the mere appellation "reformer" or "Protestant". There were differences between the more reform minded English and their Protestant contemporaries on the continent. The much discussed position of Cranmer on the Eucharist may here be used as an example. Cranmer had originally held the traditional view that the bread and wine were, at consecration, changed into the real and substantial Body and Blood of Christ. From this point his opinions appear to have gone through two phases of development: first, a phase in which he rejected transubstantiation but held to the Real Presence - a view not unlike Luther's, although never formulated in Luther's words; second, a phase in which he rejected everything but the spiritual Presence of Christ received in the Sacrament by the believer. This was his final view and the one expressed in the volume rebutted by Gardiner.¹³ Here Cranmer approached the position of Zwingli and Hooper, with this difference - with Zwingli and Hooper the Sacrament was a service merely commemorative of Christ's death, with Cranmer it represented "our most perfect spiritual conjunction" with Christ.¹⁴ Christ's Presence at the Sacrament, though spiritual, was nevertheless very real to Cranmer. It is, however, ob-

13. Cranmer's Defence of ... the Sacrament, in Vol. II of Jenkyn's Remains of Thomas Cranmer. cf. above p. 60. The standard analysis of the Eucharistic doctrine of this period has become Dugmore's The Mass and the English Reformers (1958), to which the analysis is indebted heavily.

14. Cranmer, Defence of ... the Sacrament (ed. Jenkyn, Vol. II), pp. 308-309.

vious that his teaching struck at the roots of the traditional doctrine. This abbreviated and unsatisfactory summary of Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine is included to suggest that the development of the Reformation in England occurred neither at the same time or pace, nor over the same issues, as the continental Reformation. In a real sense, the English Reformation does have "Anglo-Protestants", very definitely reform-minded and in touch with events on the continent, but also distinct from continental developments.

It now remains to identify some of the more prominent members of this Anglo-Protestant party in England during the period under consideration. Throughout most of the period from the Act of Supremacy until his execution in 1556, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, stands as the leading ecclesiastical figure of the Anglo-Protestant wing. To a great extent, Cranmer is a theologian, outside politics, but always influential because of his position as primate and because of Henry VIII's unfailing personal affection for him. In this manner, he stands in sharp contrast to his opposite number among the Anti-Papal Catholics, Stephen Gardiner, a shrewd politician and a trained lawyer, who was not primarily a theologian and often dealt with religious problems by political means. His reputation has been variously estimated, but Archbishop Cranmer's leadership is clear throughout the period.

In the first phase (1535-1540), Thomas Cromwell stands supreme as the political leader of the Anglo-Protestant party. His training, his influence over the King, and his unique administrative

ability all placed him as the logical leader. As vicegerent for religion he controlled not only the religious sphere, but also as one of the King's chief ministers, he controlled much of the governmental functions as well.¹⁵ While Gardiner was in France or Germany, Cromwell was safe and had a relatively free hand; but his fall was swift, and within a year of being created Earl of Essex he was executed by the King he tried to serve.

Cromwell's position attracted many bright young men to government service, and his influence outlived him through these servants.¹⁶ We have already mentioned William Paget, diplomat, clerk of the Privy Council, Principal Secretary, and member of the Council under Mary. The irony of his rise as Cromwell's protege is perhaps that he was first recommended by Bishop Gardiner. In this early period we also can single out Thomas Starkey, Richard Morison, and various men who enjoyed ecclesiastical preferment at the time of the suppression of the monasteries: Nicholas Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury; Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester; Edward Foxe, Bishop of Hereford; and John Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester after Fisher's execution. Although most appointed after 1535 were Anti-Papal Catholics, a few reformers were elevated to the bishops' bench later on: William Barlow (friend of Robert Barnes, and the principal consecrator of Matthew Parker) at Saint David's in 1536, and Robert Holgate at Llandaff in the following year.

15. Elton, Tudor Constitution, pp. 217, 333, 358-359.

16. cf. Elton, Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal (Cambridge, 1973) on Cromwell's favoritism of advanced thinkers and promotion of parliamentary legislation of the "commonwealth" ideal.

After Cromwell's death, no one man came forward to fill the vacuum caused by Cromwell's execution, and this in part caused some unsettledness among Anglo-Protestants. Cranmer remained, but was frequently put in dangerous positions, and more than once was saved only by the King's intervention from imprisonment in the Tower. Catherine Parr was a Protestant influence, though limited to the royal circle. By and large, the vacuum was not filled, and this accounted in no small degree for the success of the Anti-Papal Catholics in the period 1540-1547, who experienced limited resistance from any significant organized opposition (and instead were vulnerable, at the whims of the King's caprice). John Dudley and Edward Seymour, however, emerged at the death of Henry, and each in turn made his impression on the Regency Council. The composition of the Council has been mentioned already.¹⁷

The third phase (1547-1553) displayed all the normal disadvantages of minority rule. Somerset amassed an immense personal fortune, and there was increased economic agitation (detailed above). John Knox, Peter Martyr, and Martin Bucer all entered England and took up residence in the more comfortable religious climate of the Regency. When Russell and Herbert deserted Somerset, the Regency took a more radical turn under Northumberland (Dudley, formerly the Earl of Warwick). Coverdale became Bishop of Exeter, and Ridley began more radical liturgical reforms.¹⁸

17. cf. above, pp. 35-37.

18. Russell, Crisis, pp. 130-131.

As concern grew about the King's declining health, Northumberland made a last attempt with the suggestion of Lady Jane Gray to maintain power, but in the end it was futile, as Mary and the returning Catholics ended the Regency and drove most Protestants out of the country or into hiding.

Garrett's book on the Marian exiles is a valuable resource for the final phase (1553-1555), and she notes as the leaders of the "migration", Sir Anthony Cooke, Lord John Gray, Francis Russell (second Earl of Bedford), William Parr, and Lord Cecil.¹⁹ In addition, other familiar names are present in the list of exiles: Bishop Barlow, John Cheke, Richard Cox, the martyrologist John Foxe, John Ponet (first bishop consecrated under the 1550 Ordinal, and recipient of the see from which Gardiner was deprived in 1551),²⁰ and many others.

Of those who remained in England, the story of the persecution is well known. Hooper, Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer were only the most famous of the almost 300 who perished at the stake.²¹ How far Gardiner was responsible for the persecutions is a debatable question. He no doubt approved of the act, which passed the House of Lords while he presided there as Chancellor, for the revival of heresy laws.²² Neither is there any doubt that he sat in judge-

19. Christina H. Garrett, The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.

20. *Ibid.*, 253-258; cf. also Herbert Chitty (ed.), Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poyntet, Episcoporum Wintoniensium; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.

21. cf. above, p. 10, n. 5.

22. 1/2 Philip and Mary, c. 6 (1554).

ment on Bishop Hooper, and on several other preachers whom he condemned to be degraded from the priesthood. The natural consequences of this was that when they declined, as laymen, to be reconciled to the Church, they were handed over to the secular arm to be burned. In his own diocese, however, no victim of persecution is known to have suffered until after his death; and much as he was already maligned by his opponents, there is strong evidence that his natural disposition was humane and generous. It is of note that Cranmer was not condemned to the stake until after Gardiner's death. Thus, a real pause came to the movements as both Gardiner and Cranmer, who spanned the period from the Act of Supremacy until the reign of Mary, died within a year of each other, and the leadership passed to a younger generation.

IV

Having considered the differences between the Anti-Papal Catholics and the Anglo-Protestants, we now turn to the differences between the Anti-Papal Catholics and the Papalists. Here the positions are less distinct, for both groups consider themselves Catholic, and on many, if not most, religious issues, their views are similar. Further, the denial of the King's title, Supreme Head of the Church in England, constituted treason; confessing strict Catholicism in its Papal variety would thus entail treason. After the initial group of executions following the passage of the royal supremacy, we find fewer and fewer accusations of treason on this ground alone, for most Papalists either left the country or went underground. So a comparison between the two parties at many points is difficult, mainly because of the lack of a prominent Papalist standard with which to compare other positions.

It is also difficult to trace the influence of this party on the course of English politics. Certainly there was a positive influence in the earliest phase, in the persons of More, Fisher, and others, but the Papalist side grows still and quiet after the executions of 1535, and the party does not return in full force until the accession of Mary. But it would appear that the group maintains a negative influence even in exile, and the presence of small pockets of Papalism (relatively undisturbed), especially around Queen Mary, does continue throughout the period.

There is an incident which is indicative of the positions of these two parties. On his way back from the Diet of Ratisbon, Gardiner passed through Louvain, "with a great rout and bravery, and was there, at a private man's house called Jeremy's, most honourably entertained and received; where the faculty of divines, for honour's sake, presented him wine in the name of the whole university." But someone remembered that he was the author of a book on True Obedience, a copy of which was, it seems, found in the university. When the learned doctors had perused it, "they did not only repent them for attributing such their honour unto him, but boldly enterprised to dispute with him concerning the Pope's supremacy."

The Bishop stoutly defended his said oration. The divines, contrary, did stiffly maintain their opinion, and divers time openly, with exclamation, called the said Bishop an excommunicate, and a schismatic, to the no little reproach and infamy of the English nation. ... The Bishop, not long after, minding to say Mass in St. Peter's Church, they did deny unto him, as to an excommunicate person, the ornaments and vestments meet for the same; wherewith being highly offended, he suddenly hastened his journey from thence.

This story is significant for our purposes for two reasons. First, it shows that, whatever anyone else thought, Gardiner thought that he himself was a Catholic. Second, it points up the divergence between Gardiner and the Papalists, in this case concerning the

1. Letter from Francis Driander to Edmund Crispin, 22 September 1541, quoted in Foxe, Acts and Monuments, VI, 139; cf. ibid., VI, 202.

royal supremacy. That a person, who in England was considered an exemplar of conservatism and orthodoxy, could be snubbed as an excommunicate and schismatic points up the difference between the Anti-Papal Catholics and the Papalists over this period.

There are distinctions which appear at various points over the period. In order to more closely define the differences between Anti-Papal Catholicism and Papalism, we shall consider the major distinctions in roughly the order in which they present themselves and then consider who are the leaders of the Papalist movement in particular.

The first major difference occurs over the royal supremacy itself. In many ways, this difference is at the root of all the others, for it deals with the conceptions of State and Church, and the associations and relation between the two. Upon the passage of the Act of Supremacy, and the subsequent execution of Bishop Fisher for rejecting the King's title, Pope Paul III wrote two letters to vent his indignation, one to Ferdinand of Hungary, "King of the Romans", and the other to Francis I, King of France.² Both of these letters declare Henry VIII deprived of his crown and dominions on account of his crime. The intent was, presumably, both to threaten Henry with invasion from abroad and a rebellion at home. The result was two fold: the King's hand was strengthened

2. Printed and translated in Janelle, Obedience, 12-19.

in England, and what Papalism remained went so far underground that it did not reappear for quite some time; and Henry requested Gardiner to write a defence of the royal supremacy, which resulted in the production of the De Vera Obedientia. Associated with this difference over the royal supremacy is the difference over Henry's divorce. There is a good deal of literature on both sides of the question, both then and now. It is reasonable to assume that the divorce was not the only cause of the rift between Henry and Rome, for there had been signals for some time that English patriotism would begin to assert its independence from Rome soon. But the divorce question generated the greatest contemporary literature, and it is to this that we turn. Alexander Farnese, dean of the Sacred College at the time of the divorce, was soon afterwards elected as Pope Paul III, and had consistently taken the side of Catherine of Aragon; Gardiner also alludes in the De Vera Obedientia to the marriage (cf. above), which Clement VII finally declared to be legitimate, whereas in the King's own opinion it was both sinful and heretical, since it disagreed with the prescriptions of Leviticus. While the dispute over the royal supremacy declined in the period after the initial executions, the controversy over the divorce continued, indeed long after all the parties involved were dead. It was standard recusant practice in the reign of Elizabeth to impugn her pedigree, even so far as to say that Henry had not only had adulterous relations with her mother, but also with her grandmother (making Henry both Elizabeth's father

and grandfather).³ The divorce stirred the greatest amount of written invective after the Elizabethan settlement, but rather curiously little before it. However, among Anti-Papal Catholics, the divorce soon ceased to be an issue, and most heaved a sigh of relief upon the death of Catherine of Aragon, which cleared up an embarrassing situation.

The second major difference is pointed up in the Dissolution of the Monasteries. While this is part of Cromwell's scheme for redistribution of property and improving the financial status of the Crown, this, too, is linked to the royal supremacy; for some abbots who refused to "voluntarily" surrender their houses were executed for treason for defending the Papal primacy. But the link is greater than that. The Second Dissolution (1539) abolished English monasticism, and thus raised very different issues from the first dissolution. The first, though it was indefensible on the strict ecclesiastical theory that all church property was inalienable forever, could have been defended as an attempt to prune monasticism and confine it to those monks who had a genuine vocation. The second dissolution made no such claim, and only argued that the abbots had surrendered their houses "of their own free and voluntary minds, good wills and assents."⁴ In some cases

3. cf. Wm. Brown Patterson, "The Recusant View of the English Past", in Vol. 11 of Studies in Church History (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974).

4. 31 Hen. VIII, c. 13 (1539); C. H. Williams, English Historical Documents, 1485-1558; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1971. pp. 774-775.

this state of affairs could be brought about only by executing the existing abbot and choosing a compliant successor. Yet its importance for the Crown is more than merely eliminating monasticism. It was also a period when the securing of political loyalty was particularly important. It was one of the first duties of the Crown to reward its servants, and the exceptional loyalty of mid-Tudor public servants during the period of religious changes may be connected with the rewards the Crown had to offer. But this did not lead to Protestantism. One of the biggest monastic estates was built by Sir William Petre, Secretary of State, who, whatever his own religious opinions may have been, certainly left Catholic heirs.⁵ Petre was alarmed for his church property in Mary's reign, but his response was to get a private papal bull guaranteeing him in possession.⁶ The officers of the Court of Augmentations which administered the lands were mostly Catholics, and some families such as the Earls of Worcester combined large monastic estates with determined Catholicism.⁷ It is also doubtful whether the realm would have gone through as easy a reconciliation with Rome as it did if Gardiner had not insisted on the right to retain monastic lands granted to their owners upon the dissolution. The controversial literature which arises later over

5. Dickens, Reformation, p. 161 ("Sir William Petre, who accomplished the remarkable feat of remaining Secretary of State from 1544 to 1557..."); cf. also F. G. Emmison, Tudor Secretary (London, 1961).

6. F. G. Emmison, Tudor Secretary: Sir William Petre (London: Russell and Russell, 1961. pp. 269-270.

7. Russell, Crisis, p. 247.

the dissolution of the monasteries finds Catholics on both sides, Papalists dwelling on the heroic martyrdoms of those executed for support of the Papal primacy, and Anti-Papal Catholics dwelling on the rottenness of the monastic system. It would thus appear that possession of monastic estates is not a useful or accurate means of determining Catholicism, but that it does mark a difference between Papalism and Anti-Papal Catholicism.

The final series of distinctions arise in the first year of the reign of Queen Mary, as Anti-Papal Catholics (for all intents the only Catholics present in England for some time) come into contact with Papalists returning from the continent. The first Parliament of Mary was elected in the wave of reaction against Northumberland, and was presented with Gardiner's four part policy:

1. Gardiner attempted to pass through Parliament the annulment of all acts or religion in Edward VI's reign, to agree that all services should be those in the last year of Henry VIII.

2. Gardiner had the Queen, as Supreme Governor, issue injunctions reestablishing the ancient rites, and directing bishops to deprive married clergy.

3. Gardiner turned the tables on the reforming bishops and had them deprived and jailed - not desiring any further persecution. He gave both foreign reformers and many English reformers (even Cranmer) not only a chance, but also aid in escaping. Cranmer, however, stood his ground, as he could not be deprived without

papal action because he was appointed by papal bulls.

4. Gardiner did all he could to persuade Mary to marry an Englishman, not a Spaniard.⁸

Gardiner was thoroughly English in his ideals, and canny enough to know what Englishmen would stand. Had Mary stopped here and followed this policy, her reign might have been a great success. But on almost every count this policy failed. Mary married Philip II of Spain, and regarded it as a means of restoring papal authority in England, in opposition to the fourth point. Mary pushed through Parliament the reconciliation with Rome, in opposition to the first and second points, though Parliament did balk at this until assured that the Pope would not demand the restoration of Church lands. And Mary initiated the burning of heretics, in opposition to the third point. There is explanation enough for the Papalist burning zeal, but little excuse for it. There was at that time no foreign danger, no domestic disturbances. All of the prominent reformers, with Gardiner's and Cecil's help, were either on the continent or in prison. In January 1555 the Cardinal legate issued a commission to five bishops (including Gardiner) to act as a court to try heretics. Apparently none of them, except Bonner, relished the job. After the first six burnings, Gardiner and Tunstall became disgusted with the whole affair and refused to act further. Gardiner called Bonner an "ass" for

8. James A. Muller, unpublished notes. ETS Archives.

treating poor men so bloodily.⁹ But Pole and Mary continued the persecution, and in this manner almost completely rendered Gardiner's policy useless. The chief voice in the government passed to Pole, who (though a reforming cardinal) was an uncompromising Papalist in England. The policy which Gardiner had tried to enact and the Marian response would appear to be a final division between Roman Catholic and Anti-Papal Catholic sentiments. The Catholicism which returned in the form of Reginald Pole and Queen Mary was different from that which had remained in England.

The controversial literature between these two parties is limited but significant, and centered for the most part on the royal supremacy. The major treatise on the Papalist side is Cardinal Pole's work, De Unitate Ecclesiae (1536).¹⁰ Early in 1535, Thomas Starkey, who had formerly been Pole's chaplain in Italy and was now chaplain to Henry VIII, forwarded an urgent letter to Pole. This none-too-subtle communication came as a personal request from Henry seeking Pole's opinion in the causes of matrimony and concerning the authority of the Pope. Pole started to write the De Unitate in September, after the executions of More and Fisher, and dispatched it to the King the following March. The accumulated, inherited customs of the realm and of the Church, together with

9. John Harington, A Briefe View of the State of the Church of England, as it stood in Q. Elizabeths and King James his reigne, to the yeare 1608 (London, 1653), pp. 45-46.

10. Joseph G. Dwyer (ed.), Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church; Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1965.

the teachings of scripture, provide the basis of Pole's appeal to Henry in the De Unitate. Concisely phrased, his argument was based on the canonical aphorism: Rex eris, si recte facias, si non facias, non eris: you are King, if you act justly; if you act unjustly, you will no longer be King. The denial of absolute spiritual authority in the Church was, by the laws of logic, implicit in Henry's self-appointment to the position of head of the Church. God has implanted in our souls a common sense for perceiving the need for living our lives in accord with nature. When God founded human nature, He infused a desire for social life in man, rather than in the bee or other common animals. Reason forms the ideal norm and standard of right conduct. Pole cites Cicero and the mediaeval political theory as exemplified by Isidore of Seville in support of this view: "It is just that a ruler should be bound by laws ... For whether the ruler has strengthened the peace and discipline of the Church, or whether it has been destroyed, he must render an account to Him Who entrusted the Church to his care."¹¹ Some hundred years earlier, Pole would probably have been a canonist of the papal tradition, in that era of the conciliar theorists. As it happened, however, Pole was a product of the Renaissance humanist tradition. In his use of the Fathers, he was the positive rather than the speculative theologian. He

11. Ibid., p. 29.

appealed to the Church Fathers chiefly for their authority. He found in them overwhelming evidence for the superiority of the spiritual power, including that of the Papacy and the episcopacy.¹² Pole's arguments were thus directly adapted to the intrinsic exigencies of the early sixteenth century religious and political upheaval.

The controversial literature on the royal supremacy from the Papalist side is slim, but the response to the Anti-Papal Catholic literature about the supremacy was quick and harsh. The Admiral of France called Gardiner "un grand poltrone"; Dr. Ortiz, Catherine's proctor at Rome, wrote that while Gardiner was formerly accounted among the good, he was now one of the worst. The Bishop of Faenza, Papal Nuncio in France, called him a rascal (scoperto ribaldissimo). The Pope said Gardiner was a scoundrel.¹³

Reginald Cardinal Pole stands out as the leading Papalist in the three party system we have proposed after the deaths of More and Fisher. It would be convenient to find continued Roman Catholic presence in England after the Act of Supremacy until the return of Cardinal Pole in 1554, but that would perhaps make it too easy. Papalism, in its strictest sense, was illegal and treasonous under Henry and Edward, for its assertion of Papal primacy. If we were to find Papalist names in England, it would probably be because

12. Ibid., pp. 145f.

13. L. P., IX, 548, 873, 947.

of their executions. There was a small group around Mary to serve in her chapel, and there were a few who fled to the continent after the Act of Supremacy. But the influence of this group from 1535 until 1553 is not by force of numbers in England, nor by well placed government officials who defended Papal primacy, but rather by the influence of continental Catholicism, by the visibility of Pole and Mary, by the threats of Paul III, and by the feeling that eventually (if something drastic did not happen first) that Mary would come to the throne and restore Papalism. Similarly, in the reign of Elizabeth, Papalism does exercise some influence from within England, but a great portion of its influence (albeit negative) comes from Rome, and in particular from the seminaries in Louvain, Douay, Rheims, and other places. In a similar way, Papalism influences England in the period 1535-1553 not so much from within England as without it, and in a strong way.

After the accession of Mary, Papalism once again returned and became official. Pole became chief minister, and after the death of Gardiner, Mary turned to her cousin more and more. On a larger scale, the universities revived. The University of Oxford was used for the trials of Latimer, Ridley and Cranmer, with the prosecutor disputing for the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Here also we find Thomas Harding, Nicholas Sanders, and William Allen, all to become important in the defence of Catholicism in Elizabeth's reign. For new vitality, a new generation of clergy had to be trained, and the place to look for the vitality of the

Marian church is in the place which trained them - the universities. Cambridge had been suspect since the 1520's, and the university which Mary trusted most was Oxford. Pole was appointed Chancellor, and the Canon Law faculty was revived. What Henrician Cambridge contributed to the Reformation, Marian Oxford contributed to the Counter Reformation, and if Mary had lived another fifteen years she could have had as brilliant a bench of Catholic bishops as any in the history of the country.

The events of the twenty years between 1535 and 1555 were many and diverse. What has been proposed is one way of understanding and making sense out of a turbulent and confusing period of history whose effects are still with us.

The tripartite system outlined above may be summarized briefly. The party of Papalists, led by Thomas More, John Fisher, and Reginald Pole, is characterized by standard and orthodox Catholicism coupled with defence of the Papal primacy. It opposed the royal supremacy and the dissolution of the monasteries, and returned to power with Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole. While in power it contracted an alliance with Spain in the Spanish marriage and initiated a vigorous series of religious persecutions. Another party of Catholics can be distinguished from these as Anti-Papal Catholics. They are led by Stephen Gardiner and Thomas Howard, and are characterized by standard Catholicism as that had been received in England, coupled with defence of the royal supremacy. It supported the generally conservative shift of the religious and political policy after 1540, and stepped into the vacuum caused by the execution of Cromwell. Out of power in the reign of Edward, they offered limited opposition, until the accession of Mary, when they combined with the returning Papalists to run the country. The third party is that of the Anglo-Protestant faction, characterized by advanced thought and political change. Defending the royal

supremacy, they held power until the execution of their political and administrative leader, Thomas Cromwell, in 1540. A strong successor did not arise, but Thomas Cranmer carried on the general trend and supplied a limited opposition to the program of Anti-Papal Catholicism. Brought back into power by the turn in the Regency Council, the Anglo-Protestants quickly brought about political and religious changes, in particular the Prayer Books and the revision of discipline (clerical marriage, etc.). A considerable controversial literature grew, in particular about the Eucharist, between these and the Anti-Papal Catholics. Upon the accession of Mary, many left the country, and others went into hiding as a persecution began and intensified as Anti-Papal Catholic leadership declined in the Marian Court.

The one question left is whether this party which we have labelled as Anti-Papal Catholic survived the death of Bishop Gardiner, or continued on into the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Marian bench of bishops was deprived by Elizabeth, though there are indications that she would have preferred to work with them in the establishment of her settlement. The question is a vexed one, and one to which no clear answer may be given. I would suggest that the issues which constituted Anti-Papal Catholicism in the period of the Act of Supremacy changed after the death of Mary, and that as a different generation of leaders came to power in 1558, the party structure changed. Gardiner, Pole, Cranmer, Mary, Latimer, Ridley, and Norfolk all died within three years of each

other. Anti-Papal Catholicism as we have limited it must either find new issues in the reign of Elizabeth, or it must die out. What those new issues might be, or whether it does die out, is beyond the scope of this study.

But the three part scheme proposed does appear to remain into the latter part of the sixteenth century. What we have constituted as the Anglo-Protestant party split into a Protestant and Puritan wing, and a renewed Papalism attacked from the continent. Many of the Protestant writers took up some of the Anti-Papal Catholic ideas, and we may even look in the synthesis of Hooker's Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity to find some of these points defended earlier by the likes of Gardiner. The tripartite division remains, in much the same way, in the reigns of James I and Charles I, and perhaps can be seen as a running motif throughout the rest of English Church History. Certainly the division (though not the parties themselves) is mirrored in the traditional Catholic, Liberal, Protestant division of the Anglican Communion.

What remains is to suggest an appreciation for Bishop Gardiner. Throughout this study we have examined and concentrated on the Bishop of Winchester, his life, his writings, his policies, his character. He was neither as bad as his detractors have suggested, nor as saintly as his friends have suggested. His merits as a theologian it is unnecessary to discuss; it is as a statesman and lawyer that he stands conspicuous. His legal temper is evident in his theological writings. They are polemic or expository, not

creative. He would have rejected the idea that theological writing might be creative. He confessed frankly that he had never been so bold as to discover any meaning in Scripture which he had not already found in some approved author. But his learning, even in divinity, was far from commonplace. He was a friend of learning in every form. He was no friend to the Reformation, but he was at least a conscientious opponent. His training not only inclined him to the conservative side in matters of Church and State, it gave him that respect for law which constrained him to insist that the actions of his sovereigns have at least the form of legality. This may not have been very high ground to take, but in an age when Machiavelli was the mirror for monarchs, when Cromwell held up the Sultan as a model for Christian princes, Gardiner rendered no little service to the continuance of constitutional government in England when he threw the weight of his personality on the side of parliamentary right and judicial custom. The truth is, there is not a single divine or statesman whose course throughout was so thoroughly consistent. Neither saint nor sinner, genius nor fool, Gardiner led his nation, his church, and his party in a troubled and troubling time. That his virtue was not equal to every trial must be admitted. But he served his God, his country, and his monarch with a devotion that was true, a zeal that was rare, and an honesty that was real, so that his reputation stands as a signal of Anti-Papal Catholicism and his learning stands as a sign of that revival of learning yet four hundred years after his

death. We have not yet begun to fully esteem Gardiner as he ought to be or as he deserves to be, but perhaps the survival of his name and career, and the survival of his country and his Church, is all the esteem he would want.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baumer, Franklin Le Van, The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.
- Burnet, Gilbert, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865.
- Carr, Samuel (ed.), Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, Martyr, 1555; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843.
- Chitty, Herbert (ed.), Registra Stephani Gardiner et Johannis Poynt, Episcoporum Wintoniensium; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.
- Cox, John Edmund (ed.), Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846.
- Cox, John Edmund (ed.), Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844.
- Dickens, Arthur Geoffrey, The English Reformation; New York: Schocken Books, 1964.
- Donaldson, Peter Samuel, A Machiavellian Treatise by Stephen Gardiner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Dwyer, Joseph G. (ed.), Pole's Defence of the Unity of the Church; Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1965.
- Elton, Geoffrey Rudolph, England Under the Tudors; London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1974.
- Elton, Geoffrey Rudolph, Reform and Reformation: England, 1509-1558; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Elton, Geoffrey Rudolph, Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Elton, Geoffrey Rudolph, The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Elton, Geoffrey Rudolph, The Tudor Revolution in Government; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Emmison, Frederick George, Tudor Secretary: Sir William Paget; London: Russell and Russell, 1961.
- Foxe, John, Acts and Monuments, with a life and defence of the Martyrologist by George Townsend (3d ed. rev. by Josiah Pratt); London: Seeley, 1853-1870. (8 vols. in 16)
- Frere, W. H. (ed.), Registrum Matthei Parker, Diocesis Cantuariensis A.D. 1559-1575; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928.

- Gairdner, James, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary; London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1904.
- Gairdner, James, J. S. Brewer, and R. H. Brodie, Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, Preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and Elsewhere in England; London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1862-1910. (21 vols.)
- Garrett, Christina H., The Marian Exiles; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Harbison, Elmore Harris, Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
- Harington, John, A Briefe View of the State of the Church of England, as it stood in Q. Elizabeths and King James his Reigne, to the Yeare 1608; London, 1653.
- Hoak, D. E., The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Hughes, Paul L. and James F. Larkin, Tudor Royal Proclamations; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964. (2 vols.)
- Hughes, Philip, A Popular History of the Reformation; Garden City, New York: Hanover House, 1957.
- The Institution of a Christen Man; London, 1537.
- Janelle, Pierre (ed.), Obedience in Church and State: Three Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner; New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- Jones, Whitney R. D., The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1563; London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1973.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar, The Matrimonial Trials of Henry VIII; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Lacey, T. A. (ed.), The King's Book, or, A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, 1543; London, S.P.C.K., 1932.
- Lehmberg, Stanford E., The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII; 1536-1547; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Lehmberg, Stanford E., The Reformation Parliament, 1529-1536; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Leland, John, Principium, ac illustrium aliquot et eruditorum in Anglia virorum Encomia, Trophea, Genethliaca, et Epithalamia; London, 1589.
- Loades, D. M., "The Enforcement of Reaction, 1553-1558" in Journal of Ecclesiastical History XVI (1965), pp. 54-66.

- Mathew, David, The Courtiers of Henry VIII; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1970.
- Muller, James Arthur (ed.), The Letters of Stephen Gardiner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933.
- Muller, James Arthur, Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction; New York: Octagon Books, 1970.
- Patterson, William Brown, "The Recusant View of the English Past" in Studies in Church History: Materials, Sources and Methods of Ecclesiastical History (Vol. 11), ed. Derek Baker; Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- Pollard, Albert Frederick, England under Protector Somerset; London: Russell and Russell, 1966.
- Pollard, Albert Frederick, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI. to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603) New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1910.
- Reynolds, E. E., Saint John Fisher; Wheathampstead: Anthony Clarke Books, 1955.
- Russell, Conrad, The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509-1660; New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Scarisbrick, J. J., Henry VIII; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.
- Shirley, T. F., Thomas Thirlby, Tudor Bishop; London: S.P.C.K., 1964.
- Strype, John, Ecclesiastical Memorials; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1822. (3 vols. in 6).
- Tittler, Robert and Jennifer Loach, The Mid-Tudor Polity, c. 1540-1560; Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980.
- Williams, C. H., English Historical Documents, 1485-1558; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1971.
- Zeeveld, William Gordon, Foundations of Tudor Policy; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948.